

THE  
CLASSICAL  
REVIEW

---

OXFORD  
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS  
LONDON NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE  
GEOFFREY CUMBERLEGE : OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

# THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

*Editors* C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3 The University, Glasgow, W. 2  
R. M. RATTENBURY, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge

*All communications intended for the Editors should be sent to Mr. Fordyce. Books for review should be sent to the Editors, c/o The Clarendon Press, Oxford.*

## BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

Professor E. H. Warmington, M.A. (Chairman)	} <i>Representing the Council of the Classical Association</i>
Professor R. G. Austin, M.A. (Hon. Treas.)	
F. H. Sandbach, M.A.	
Professor F. W. Walbank, M.A., F.B.A.	
Professor W. S. Watt, M.A. (Hon. Sec.)	
A. G. Woodhead, M.A., representing the Cambridge Philological Society	
M. Platnauer, B.Litt., M.A., representing the Oxford Philological Society	

*With the co-operation of*

Professor B. D. Meritt, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton,  
Professor J. A. FitzHerbert, University of Adelaide, and  
Professor Homer A. Thompson, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton

*New Series*

*Volume VI, No. 2*

*June 1956*

## CONTENTS

Mnasalces: Notes and Queries	A. S. F. GOW 91
Greek Verses from the Eighth Century B.C.	D. L. PAGE 95
A Matter of Taste in Horace ( <i>Sat.</i> ii. 7. 95 ff.)	M. J. MCGANN 97
Ammianea	E. E. L. OWENS 99
Aeschylus, <i>Persae</i> 647-8	M. PLATNAUER 102
<i>Airs, Waters, Places</i> , 16	J. S. MORRISON 102
Plutarch, <i>Moralia</i> 351 F	J. GWYN GRIFFITHS 103
Virgil, <i>Aeneid</i> xii. 451	R. D. WILLIAMS 104

## REVIEWS:

*Sophocle*, i (Dain, Mazon), A. M. DALE, 105; *A Concordance to Euripides* (Allen and Italic), H. C. BALDREY, 107; *The Political Plays of Euripides* (Zuntz), P. T. STEVENS, 109; *Marginalia Scaenica* (Jackson), M. PLATNAUER, 112; *Greek Drama for Everyman* (Lucas), A. H. COXON, 116; *Démosthène, Plaidoyers politiques*, i (Navarre), A. N. BRYAN-BROWN, 117; *La notion du divin depuis Homère jusqu'à Platon* (Entretiens Hardt), J. TATE, 119; *La théorie aristotélicienne de l'intellect d'après Théophraste* (Barbotin), G. B. KERFERD, 121; *Plutarch, De Musica* (Lasserre), E. K. BORTHWICK, 122; *The Greek Particles* (Denniston), J. TATE, 125; *Estructura del sistema de aspectos y tiempos del verbo griego antiguo* (Ruipérez), D. M. JONES, 126; *Studies on Intensification in Early and Classical Greek* (Thesleff), H. L. HUDSON-WILLIAMS, 128; *Terenti Comoedias* (Prete), O. SKUTSCH, 129; *Ad Herennium* (Caplan), A. E. DOUGLAS, 133; *Sallustio* (Sangiacomo),

[Continued on p. 3 of cover]

# The Classical Review

NEW SERIES VOLUME VI NO. 2

(VOLUME LXIX OF THE CONTINUOUS SERIES)

June 1956

## MNASALCES

### Notes and Queries

A.P. vii. 194

Ἀκρίδα Δαμοκρίτου μελεσίπτερον ἄδε θανοῦσαν  
ἄργιλος δολιχὰν ἀμφὶ κέλευθον ἔχει,  
ὡς καὶ ὅτ' ἰθὺσειε πανέσπερον ὕμνον αἰεῖδεν  
πᾶν μέλαθρον μολπᾶς ἰαχ' ὑπ' εὐκελάδου.

This epigram must be considered in conjunction with a quatrain by Phaennus, A.P. vii. 197: Δαμοκρίτῳ μὲν ἐγὼ, λιγυρὰν ὅκα μοῦσαν ἐνείην (ἀν- Hermann) | ἀκρίς ἀπὸ πτερύγων, τὸν βαθὺν ἄγον ὕπνον | Δαμόκριτος δ' ἐπ' ἐμοὶ τὸν εὐκότα | τύμβον, ὀδῖτα, | ἐγγύθεν Ὀρωπόου χεῦεν ἀποφθιμένα. Phaennus is one of Meleager's poets,<sup>1</sup> but beyond that nothing is known of his date, on which his only other surviving epigram, a commonplace quatrain on Leonidas,<sup>2</sup> throws no light. It seems more likely that he is borrowing a theme from Mnasalces than that both are writing independently on the same event, but Phaennus need not on that account be an appreciably later poet.

Suidas quotes Mnasalces' first couplet s.v. ἀργιλάδης γῆ, and some ancient authority therefore understood ἄργιλος to be a form of light-coloured earth or clay, as did modern scholars until Brunck said it was a place-name. Since then all editors except Paton (who leaves the question open) have printed the word with a capital Α. Argilus is the name of a town on the Strymon, and Brunck, noting that in Phaennus the insect was interred near Oropus and learning from Stephanus Byz. that there was an Oropus near Amphipolis, assumed the δολιχὰ κέλευθος to connect Argilus and Oropus; he also, and somewhat absurdly, envisaged the tomb midway between the two towns. Unfortunately however Brunck overlooked the fact, which is reasonably plain, that the Oropus and Amphipolis concerned were not in Macedonia but in Syria.<sup>3</sup> Those who, notwithstanding this set-back, cling to the idea that Ἀργιλος is a place-name might indeed argue that Ἀργ- is a common element in place-names and there may have been other places besides that on the Strymon called Argilus; or alternatively that if Phaennus was merely improvising on Mnasalces' theme his Oropus<sup>4</sup> need have no connexion with the latter's Argilus.

<sup>1</sup> A.P. iv. i. 29.

<sup>2</sup> A.P. vii. 437.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. R.E. xviii. 1. 1175.

<sup>4</sup> Before leaving Oropus I remark (whether relevantly or not I have no idea) that I.G. vii. 395 is an honorific inscription from the Amphiareum at Oropus on the

Euripus in favour of Μνασάλκης Μνασίππου Σικυώνιος, and Wilhelm (Sitz. Wien Ak. 179. 6, p. 3) possibly supposed it to relate to the epigrammatist, who is known to have been a Sicyonian. Cf. Wilamowitz, *Hell. Dicht.* i. 138.

There are however difficulties. In the first place if Ἄργιλος is the name of a town ἄδε is intolerable and must be altered, as indeed Salmasius had already altered it,<sup>1</sup> to ὤδε. In the second, the inhabitants of Argilus, like those of other places, might have buried their dead by the side of roads leading from the place (ἀμφὶ κέλευθον as, for example, *Il.* i. 409 ἀμφ' ἄλα), and Damocritus might have seen fit to inter his ἀκρίς among them; but if the road is to be qualified at all it should be by a description distinguishing it from other roads, and such an adjective as δολιχά can hardly discharge that function.

Since therefore Brunck's hypothesis has been deprived of such charm as it ever possessed, it now seems time to revert to the interpretation of Suidas, and to see in ἄργιλος a description of the burial, whether a pottery vessel is meant,<sup>2</sup> or a mere clod, or a plot of ground. I further suggest that δολιχὰν ἀμφὶ κέλευθον means not 'beside the long road' but (as it is now free to do) 'throughout the long journey' (as, for example, *Pind. O.* i. 97 λοιπὸν ἀμφὶ βιότον), and that the journey is that which Antigone in *Soph. Ant.* 807 calls τὰν νεάταν ὁδὸν and the nurse in *Trach.* 874 τὴν πανυστάτην ὁδὸν ἀπασῶν—the journey from this world to the next. Pets and domestic animals, more often than others, may be destined, like their masters, for Hades, and, if they do not fly there like the ἀκρίς in *A.P.* vii. 189, they proceed by the same route, which in their case Simias calls πυμάτα εἰς Ἀχέροντος ὁδός, Tymnes σιωπηραὶ νυκτὸς ὁδοί, and Catullus iter tenebrosissimum.<sup>3</sup> If I have rightly interpreted δολιχὰ κέλευθος the euphemism will much resemble Dioctimus' εὐρεῖται πύλαι for Hades in *A.P.* vii. 475.<sup>4</sup>

Ἀκρίς, here rendered in current versions locusta, sauterelle, locust, I have so far refrained from translating because, as I have said elsewhere,<sup>5</sup> the word is not precise and may mean any orthopterous insect—locust, grasshopper, cricket, and others. In many cases it is impossible to tell which is meant,<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ἄδε is the accentuation in Suidas; P has ἄδε, which Brunck retained in the erroneous belief that it was Doric for ὤδε.

<sup>2</sup> Ἄργιλος does not occur in connexion with pottery, but this may well be an accident for the word is rare and the Lat. *argilla* is frequently so used.

<sup>3</sup> *A.P.* vii. 203, 199, 211, *Cat.* 3. 11. For other pets in Hades see, e.g., *A.P.* vii. 190, 213, 364, ix. 432, *Mart.* xi. 69; for other animals *Theocr.* 4. 26, 25. 271. The road taken by humans is called εὐρώεντα κέλευθα by Homer (*Od.* xxiv. 10), κοῖλα ἀγνὰ θνασκόντων by Pindar (*O.* 9. 34), and ἡ ἀπὸ πυρκαϊῆς κέλευθος by Hegesippus (*A.P.* vii. 545); the first and last are among the many passages which signpost it for us.

<sup>4</sup> On which see *C.R.* lxix. 240. The absence of the def. art. there and here may possibly be felt to be a difficulty, but it is absent also from similar phrases in *A.P.* vii. 199, 203, 211 and its absence is hardly more noticeable in this than in the accepted interpretation of δολιχὰ κέλευθος. It is, moreover, a part of speech in which Mnaseas at any rate is remarkably parsimonious. In 76 lines he has it five times in connexion with proper names (*vi.* 264, vii. 171, ix. 324, and twice in *Anth.*

*App.* iii. 71) but otherwise only in ἄ σθριγξ, voc. (ix. 324), and τοῖς καλοῖς (xii. 138; see below). In vii. 54, 212 τοῦ and τᾶς are relatives.

<sup>5</sup> *C.Q.* xxix. 67.

<sup>6</sup> Locusts, grasshoppers, and crickets are superficially much alike. It may be doubted whether Greek laymen distinguished between locusts and grasshoppers, and though *Arist. H.A.* 550<sup>b</sup>32 (cf. 556<sup>a</sup>8) ἀπτεράβου καὶ ἀκρίδες seems to draw the distinction, the first word is used by others to denote immature locusts somewhat more advanced than βροῦχοι (βροῦκοι). If they distinguished crickets I do not know what they called them; possibly τρωξάλλιδες (cf. *Plin. N.H.* xxx. 49), but as in *Alex. fr.* 15. 12 these are alleged to have created a shortage of vegetables they too may be locusts. *Μολούρις* I have discussed in *C.Q.* xlv. 104; I leave others to sort out ἀσίρακος or ὄνος, κόρνοψ, μάσταξ, ὄρπος, πάρνοψ, πετηλῖς, and to deal with *Ael. N.A.* vi. 19 βομβοῦσαν ἀκρίδα καὶ πάρνοπα ὑποκρίζοντα καὶ μὴ σιωπῶσαν τρωξάλλίδα. See, however, *R.E.* viii. 1381, *Quellen u. Stud. z. Gesch. d. Naturwissensch.* iv. 292, D. W. Thompson on *Arist. H.A.* 555<sup>b</sup>18.



but in some, and I think in this, it is possible. Locusts and grasshoppers (*Acridiidae*) stridulate by scraping the hind femur against the wing-case, long-horned grasshoppers (*Tettigoniidae*) and crickets (*Gryllidae*) by rubbing the wings together.<sup>1</sup> The movements are not difficult to observe, and when Meleager (*A.P.* vii. 195) speaks of an ἀκρίς as ἐγκρούουσα φλόις ποσσι λάλους πτέρυγας, though he does not distinguish wing from wing-case (ἐλντρον),<sup>2</sup> he plainly describes a locust or grasshopper. Aristotle (*H.A.* 535<sup>b</sup>12) did not mention the wings but said merely τοῖς πηδαλίοις τρίβουσαι because the movement of the leg is the visible cause of the sound, and when poets mention only the wings, as Mnasalces and Phaennus here,<sup>3</sup> they may perhaps be trusted to mean long-horned grasshopper or cricket. Since crickets conspicuously stridulate at night, Mnasalces' πανέσπερον and Phaennus' βαθὺς ὕπνος point to the second, and the versions should have been grillus, grillon, cricket.<sup>4</sup>

# A.P. ix. 333

Στῶμεν ἀλινράντου παρὰ χθαμαλὰν χθόνα πόντου  
δερχόμενοι τέμενος Κίπριδος εἰναλίας  
κράναν τ' αἰγέροις κατάσκιον, ἄς ἀπο νῆμα  
ξοῦθαί ἀφύσσονται χεῖλεσιν ἀλκυόνες.

1 χθαμαλὰν Plan. -λὸν P 3 αἰγέροις Plan.

The first line of this quatrain is open to two obvious objections. *Ἀλινράντος* is no likely adjective to apply to the sea,<sup>5</sup> and *χθόνα πόντου* has no meaning;

<sup>1</sup> See Imms, *Text. of Entom.*<sup>3</sup>, 246, 248, 249; Uvarov, *Locusts and Grasshoppers*, 29; Fabre, *Life of the Grasshopper* (1917), 177, 222, 250.

<sup>2</sup> So Plin. *N.H.* xi. 267 *pinnarum et feminum attritu*.

<sup>3</sup> Mnasalces writes of another ἀκρίς (vii. 192) πτερύγεσσι λυγυφθόγγοισιν ἑλίσσει and ἐκ πτερύγων κρέκουσα μέλος; Simias' ἀγλωσσον στόμα (vii. 193) is imprecise but not incorrect, unlike the otherwise accomplished poet of *I.G.* xiv. 1934 f. whose ἀκρίς and cicada both make vocal music.

<sup>4</sup> The cicada produces its rattle very differently by vibrating membranes in the thorax (cf. Arist. *H.A.* 535<sup>b</sup>7), but Meleager (vii. 196) gives one the apparatus of a locust (πριονώδη κῶλα) and Archias (vii. 213), if I understand him, that of a cricket (εὐταρσος ἰξύς), and earlier writers also had mistakenly supposed a cicada's wings to be the source of the sound (Hes. *W.D.* 584, Alc. fr. 39). Nicias may make the same mistake in vii. 200, where he writes ἀπὸ ραδινῶν φθόγγον ἰεῖς πτερύγων of an insect which the lemmatist took for a cicada—perhaps rightly, for though the creature is not named in the quatrain it was tree-haunting and the participles attaching to it are masc.

Since the cicada's sound-producing apparatus is invisible externally these inferences from other insects are not very surprising; that the poets should have confused the insects themselves is hardly credible, for the cicada's note is different, its appearance

totally different, from those of crickets and grasshoppers, and cicadas are plainly distinguished from the other species by engravers of coins and gems (see Imhoof-Blumer and Keller, *Tier- u. Pflanzenbilder*, Index s.vv. Cicade, Heupferd, Heuschrecke). Fabre (*Life of the Grasshopper*, 233) had indeed postulated such a confusion on other grounds. He had read that Greeks kept cicadas in captivity, and argued that no sane person would want a cicada rattling in the house, and that it is in any case impossible to keep a cicada in captivity. The first argument is of little weight, for Greeks liked noise (cf. N. Douglas, *Birds and Beasts of the Gk. Anth.*, p. 190), but the second is cogent. Cicadas, which live on the sap of growing trees and shrubs, would quickly starve and probably be silent in a cage. Fabre's ultimate authorities were presumably Anyte's epitaph on an ἀκρίς and a τέττιξ buried together by Myro (*A.P.* vii. 190), and the imitation by Marcus Arg. (ibid. 364); but though the insects are described by Anyte as παίρνια it does not follow that they were kept in captivity, and her opening lines ἀκρίδι τῇ κατ' ἄρουραν ἀγδόνι καὶ δρυοκοίτῃ | τέττιγι suggest that they were not (cf. Starkie, *Ar. Ach.*, p. 254). *A.P.* vii. 192, 200, 201 also are epitaphs for insects which did not die in cages.

<sup>5</sup> *Ἀλίκλυτος πόντος* in *Orph. Arg.* 333 is not much of a defence, but, as D. L. Page reminds me, verbals in -τος are capable of an active sense; see Fraenkel on Aesch *Ag.* 12.

and suspicion is thus focused on *πόντου*. Though it seems not to have occurred to the authors of the numerous and violent alterations recorded by Stadtmueller, the simplest way of mending the line would be to substitute a place-name for *πόντου*; and the simplest way of doing that would be to write the word with a capital *Π*. Such a proposal is necessarily speculative, and I address myself only to some objections which might be advanced against it. If Mnasalces is rightly dated in the mid-third century, Mithridates had established his kingdom thirty years earlier, and though it may not yet have been known as Pontus that name must have been taken from current local usage.<sup>1</sup> Third-century interest in the area is sufficiently attested by the long gazeteer of the south coast of the Euxine in the second book of the *Argonautica*, and l. 2 seems appropriate to that coast, which, though largely lined with cliffs, includes also beaches and is, for long stretches from west of the Halys to east of the Iris, low and wooded.<sup>2</sup> Apollonius does not indeed mention a shrine of Aphrodite in his survey, but her temples were common enough on Greek coasts<sup>3</sup> and between Lemnos and Colchis the Argonauts had little leisure for this deity.

It will perhaps be felt that Mnasalces is here inspired by a quatrain of Anyte (*A.P.* ix. 144) which gives no indication of place. Mnasalces however, though he models himself closely on Anyte, is no slavish imitator, and whereas she surveys the sea from the precinct, he surveys the precinct from somewhere else and has more cause to be precise. Where he surveys it from is less clear. T. L. Agar<sup>4</sup> suggested that *παρὰ χθόνα* meant 'off shore' and that the spectators were bidden to heave to or rest on their oars to enjoy the view; and I cannot find in grammars or lexica a defence for *παρὰ c. acc.* meaning simply 'on'. Anyte however makes a dead dolphin say (vii. 215) *πόντου νοτὶς ὦσ' ἐπὶ χέρσιν* | *κείμεναι δὲ ῥαδινὰν τάνδε παρ' αἰόνα*, perhaps 'stretched on' as in *Il.* iv. 487, and though the verb makes a difference it may be that judgment should be suspended.

In the second couplet the defence of *κατάσκιον c. gen.* by the analogy of the *gen.* with adjectives in *-στεφής*<sup>5</sup> seems precarious. Planudes, who has the epigram in two places, wrote *αἰγέλοις*, but this remedy, though plausible enough, is too simple to be altogether convincing. Perhaps therefore we should consider whether *αἰγέλοις*, too, may not be a place-name. Places were often named from vegetation conspicuous in the neighbourhood (e.g. Cissus, Pteleum), Aegirus is the name of a *κώμη* near Methymna<sup>6</sup> and an alternative name for Aegirusa in the Megarid,<sup>7</sup> and Aegira is also a place-name. The '(h)alcyons' are as enigmatic here as elsewhere,<sup>8</sup> but *ἀφύσσονται* should mean 'draw' not 'drink',<sup>9</sup> and would be appropriate to such birds as swifts, swallows, or martins, which carry mud from moist places to construct their nests.<sup>10</sup> If that is what his halcyons are doing Mnasalces has added an unobtrusive touch of spring to the picture.

<sup>1</sup> Xenophon's use of the word is elusive, but sometimes at any rate he seems to use it of the south shore rather than of the sea or of the area generally; see *An.* v. 6. 15, vi. 5. 20.

<sup>2</sup> *Black Sea Pilot*, 1942, pp. 399, 401.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Farnell, *Cults*, ii. 637. The assertion of the lemmatist that the epigram relates to the temple at Cnidus is obviously a guess.

<sup>4</sup> *C.Q.* xvii. 84.

<sup>5</sup> Archil. fr. 21, Soph. *El.* 895, *O.T.* 83, and less plainly *Il.* viii. 232, *Od.* ii. 431.

<sup>6</sup> Strab. xiii. 617.

<sup>7</sup> Steph. Byz.; cf. Suid. s.v.

<sup>8</sup> See D. W. Thompson, *Gloss. Gk. Birds*, s.v.

<sup>9</sup> There may be exceptions but the nearest I have found—*A.P.* v. 226 (Paul. Sil.)—is centuries later and not exact.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. *Ar. Av.* 1151.

A.P. xii. 138

Ἀμπελε, μήποτε φύλλα χαμαὶ σπείδουσα βάλεσθαι  
 δεΐδιας ἐσπέριον Πλειάδα δυομέναν;  
 μέινον ἐπ' Ἀντιλέοντι πεσεῖν ὑπὸ τὴν γλυκὺν ὕπνον  
 ἐς τότε τοῖς καλοῖς πάντα χαρίζομένα.  
 3 τὴν Meineke τὸν P

A vine which is shedding its leaves prematurely as though in fear of winter is bidden to preserve them in order to honour Antileon with a *φύλλοβολία* when he falls asleep beneath it—despite the sneers of Wilamowitz<sup>1</sup> pretty enough *vers d'occasion* given a vine known to the persons concerned which was behaving so.<sup>2</sup>

In l. 3 τὸν is unintelligible, and Meineke's τὴν is satisfactory unless τοι should be preferred. L. 4 has been much assailed, and since we are without Stadtmueller, I had better record the suggestions known to me. 'Ες τότε was altered to ὡς τότε by Boissonade followed by Duebner ('quemadmodum tunc et olim quando Ampelus eras'), ἔσσο τε by Hecker, ἐς τότε by Maehly ('bisher'), ὕστατα by Ludwig; and, with the further alteration of χαρίζομένα to χαρίζομεθα, to ἐστ' ὅτε by Salmasius and Meineke, and ἐσθλ' ὅτε by Schneidewin. Ludwig subsequently proposed ἐσπομένοις καλοῖς and said 'die Liebhaber wollen ihm folgen und . . . mit dem Weinlaube bekranzen'.<sup>3</sup> The dead set against ἐς τότε is intelligible so long as those words are supposed to mean 'until that time' for they then make no sense. They are however also capable of meaning 'at that (future) time',<sup>4</sup> and 'keep your leaves until A. sleeps beneath you and then bestow them all as a favour to the fair' (by dropping them on him) is precisely the meaning required. Hermann's καλὰ (for πάντα)<sup>5</sup> and Sitzler's τῷ καλῷ<sup>6</sup> are both deleterious and need not be considered. The tense of the participle however raises a doubt. The present bears some resemblance to δερκόμενοι in the last epigram and could perhaps be defended, but if alteration is needed χαρίζομένα is a minimal change.<sup>7</sup>

Trinity College, Cambridge

A. S. F. GOW

## GREEK VERSES FROM THE EIGHTH CENTURY B.C.

G. BUCHNER and C. F. Russo have recently published<sup>8</sup> what they judge to be the earliest writing in the Greek alphabet known to us, excepting only the Dipylon jug with its *ὁς νῦν ὀρχηστῶν* etc. The text is incised on a Geometric

<sup>1</sup> *Hell. Dicht.* i. 139.

<sup>2</sup> On *φύλλοβολία* see R.E. xx. 1025. The morning setting of the Pleiads early in November marks the beginning of winter (Hes. *W.D.* 618, *al.*). Mackail translated *ἐσπέριον* 'evening' and then charged Mnasalces with 'a mistake'; it means of course 'in the west'. Arcestratus (*fr.* 36) names the setting of Orion—a period covering most of November—as the time when vines shed their leaves.

<sup>3</sup> Hecker, *Comm. Crit.* ii. 364; Maehly, *Philol.* xxv. 159; Ludwig, *Zeitschr. öst. Gymn.* xxix. 487 and *Rhein. Mus.* xli. 616. I do not know where Schneidewin discussed the line.

<sup>4</sup> L. and S. cite Dem. xiv. 24, Plat. *Legg.* 830 b: add *ibid.* 845 d, *Pol.* 262 a, *A.P.* xi.

<sup>5</sup> 243 (Nicarchus).<sup>6</sup> *Wien. Jahrb.* ciii. 226.

<sup>7</sup> Bursian xiii. 205. Τοῖς καλοῖς means in effect 'Beauty'.

<sup>8</sup> There is no need to suppose that Mnasalces would have written *χαρίζομένα*, for the inflexion of Doric futures in -ξω varies both in inscriptions and in literature. An Argive inscription has *ἐμφανίζοντας* (*Mnemos.* xlv. 220. 14) as Pindar *εὐνάξομεν* (*Pae.* 6.128), and from this verb Cretan inscriptions present both *χαρίζομεθα* and *χαρίζομεθα* (*G.D.I.* 5176. 16, 5178. 17).

<sup>9</sup> In *Accademia dei Lincei: Rendiconti* (serie viii), x (1955), 215-34, with facsimile and four plates: an exemplary publication, dedicated 'a ricordo di T. J. Dunbabin.'

cup found in a cremation-tomb at Pithecusae in 1954. The cup is provisionally dated in the third quarter of the eighth century B.C.: whatever modification may be made later, we are assured (p. 221) that there is no question of descending below that century. The inscription was added some time after the making of the cup, but still within the eighth century. It consists of three lines, running from right to left: the first line appears to approximate<sup>1</sup> to an iambic trimeter; the second and third (alined with the first, and with each other, on the right) comprise each a dactylic hexameter. They read as follows:

νεστορος: ε[...]: εὔποτ[...]: ποτεριον  
 ἡοδατοδεπ[...]: ποτερι[...]: αυτικακενον  
 ημερ[.....]εσει: καλλιστε[...]: γο: αφροδιτης

The editors supplement and interpret thus:

Νέστορος ἔ[ρρο]ι εὔποτ[ον] ποτήριον  
 ὅς δ' ἄ(ν) τοῦδε π[ίη]σι ποτηρίον, αὐτίκα κείνον  
 ἡμερ[ος αἶρ]ήσει καλλιστε[φά]νον Ἀφροδίτης.

The general sense is taken to be: 'Away with Nestor's fine drinking-cup! Whoever drinks from *this* cup will at once be possessed by longing for Love'; i.e. simply, the owner of this cup would not exchange it for the cup of Nestor celebrated in the Epic tradition.<sup>2</sup>

That must, I think, be the point intended: but I doubt whether the last word has been said about the text at two points. The inscription is of great interest from more than one point of view, and is likely to be much discussed; so it seems worth while to establish its text as exactly as possible from the start. The first edition leaves only a couple of minor matters to be settled.

v. 1. Though Archilochus might say ἔρρέτω of a shield which he had lost, and Homeric heroes say ἔρρε, ἔρρετε, ἔρρέτω to (or about) persons present or absent, I am not convinced that ἔρροι is a natural way of expressing contempt for, or indifference to, the possession of an imaginary object such as Nestor's cup. I suggest rather ε[ν:τ]ι, Νέστορος ἦν τι εὔποτον ποτήριον: ἔστι τις, ἦν τις, are common enough introductions to a theme. The space is certainly of the right size to accommodate ν:τ, though ντ alone (unlike στ) could be spread to cover it.<sup>4</sup>

v. 2. ἄ(ν) (M. Guarducci) and π[ίη]σι (E. W. Handley) are convincing supplements. But then the editors offer ποτερι[ο]: i.e. ποτηρίον, agreeing with τοῦδε; and here is a serious difficulty, as they candidly admit. The plain truth is that there is room for *two* letters of average breadth in the gap. The solitary O, a large one, written into the gap in the facsimile on p. 223, leaves a disagreeably

<sup>1</sup> The irregularity (if it is so to be judged) at the beginning of the line and the hiatus between  $\eta$  and  $\epsilon\upsilon\mu\omicron\tau$ - are characteristic of the *genre*. The possibility of Νέστωρος is considered by the editors, p. 229 n. 2.

<sup>2</sup> But the editors give good reason for thinking it unlikely that our poet had the *Iliad's* description in mind (p. 233). In general, the hexameters are strikingly un-homeric in vocabulary (πίησι, ποτήριον, καλλιστέφανος) and in formulas (αὐτίκα κείνον, ἡμερος αἰρήσει: contrast *Il.* iii. 446); see edd. pp. 230 f.

<sup>3</sup> The editors say that the dividers 'follow

a precise rule': substantives, adjectives, verbs, and adverbs are separated, pronouns and particles are not. I suggest that the evidence is insufficient for this generalization, and I can make no sense of a system in which two such coherent words as εὔποτον ποτήριον are divided whereas two such disparate elements as αὐτίκα κείνον are not. Moreover, on any rational system one would expect dividers between τοῦδε and πίησι. The writer originally left out the  $\varsigma$  of ὅς and the  $\nu$  of ἄν: there is obviously a possibility that he omitted their following dividers too.

wide empty space on its right. The editors suggest that our calligrapher was concerned to align the diacritical points before *αὐτίκα* in v. 2 with those before *ποτήριον* in v. 1: but it is not a convincing suggestion that he should insist on that trifling uniformity at the cost of so unsightly a stretch of the line. Photograph and facsimile indicate plainly that there is abundant room for two letters in the gap: *ποτερι[ov]* it must have been; and in reply to the statement that 'lo spazio esclude *ποτερι[ov]*', I observe that the accurately drawn facsimile shows the space available for ON here to be almost exactly the same as for NO in *κενον* (v. 2), and slightly greater than the space assigned to NO between *καλλιοτε[φα]* and *αφροδιτες* (v. 3).

We must start from the position that *ποτερι[ov]* was written; and opinions may then go divergent ways. Some may think it essential to the meaning that 'this cup', *τοῦδε ποτηρίου*, should be specified in words: they are free to suppose that *ποτεριον* was written in error for *ποτεριο*, perhaps corrected by deletion of N—have we not already found three mistakes, two<sup>1</sup> of them corrected, in the last half-dozen words? (1. *ποτοριον* corrected to *ποτεριον*; 2. *s* inserted between *ho* and *δα*; 3. *v* omitted after *δα*). Others may judge differently: *τοῦδε* might naturally denote the owner of the cup—the balance between *Νέστορος ποτήριον* and *τοῦδε ποτήριον* would immediately suggest this; and nobody would need to be told that *ποτήριον* in v. 2 signifies *this* cup, the one on which the inscription is written. In short, it is *not* essential that 'this cup' should be expressed in words; for the point is perfectly made by the contrast between 'Nestor's cup' and 'this man's cup'. Is it thought strange that the owner should refer to himself as *ὁδε*, not giving his name? I doubt whether we are justified in pressing him so hard. This is not a simple ownership inscription: it is a stylish epigrammatic composition, the work of one who (like so many others, I suppose, in his own time and for very long before and after) had a flair for fashioning elegant verses in the Epic manner. *τοῦδε ποτηρίου* may seem intrinsically preferable; but there is little doubt that *τοῦδε ποτήριον* was written, and nobody can say that it does not suit the sense.

Trinity College, Cambridge

D. L. PAGE

## A MATTER OF TASTE IN HORACE (*SAT.* ii. 7. 95 ff.)<sup>2</sup>

vel cum Pausiaca torpes, insane, tabella,  
qui peccas minus atque ego, cum Fulvi Rutubaeque  
aut Pacideiani contento poplite miror  
proelia rubrica picta aut carbone, velut si  
re vera pugnent, feriant vitentque moventes  
arma viri? nequam et cessator Davus; at ipse  
subtilis veterum iudex et callidus audis.

WHY does Horace here speak of a painting by Pausias? It may be that he was in fact an amateur of that painter's work and that here, as doubtless elsewhere in the satire (e.g. 22 ff., 28 ff., 111 ff.), Davus' criticism has in view a real

<sup>1</sup> All three, according to the editors. At the end of (and on the same line as) v. 2, above the last letters of v. 3, is written in isolation the letter N followed immediately by EI, whatever that may signify. The editors suggest that the N refers to the omission of N after ΔA in v. 2, while the other symbol is numerical, a modification of the

fifth letter of the alphabet, signifying the place where N should be inserted, viz. after the fifth letter of the line. This is very ingenious; those who think it far-fetched must find some other explanation.

<sup>2</sup> I wish to express my gratitude to Professor M. J. Boyd for reading and criticizing a draft of this note.

trait in the character of his master. But it may be shown that even if we leave this possibility aside, as indeed we must if we wish to consider the effect of the passage on the many readers who would know nothing of Horace's tastes in painting, the reference is still most appropriate.<sup>1</sup> To gain an understanding of what was in Horace's mind when he referred to a *Pausiaca tabella* we must consider Pausias' work, as far as it is possible for us to form an idea of it, and the character of the man into whose mouth Horace has put these lines.

Pausias was a pupil of Pamphilus, one of the leaders of the Sicyonian 'school'.<sup>2</sup> His favourite subjects were boys and flowers. In representing these his command of the encaustic technique of colouring, in the use of which we are told he was the first to gain distinction, was doubtless of great importance. The influence of the Sicyonian 'school', which was characterized by an intellectual attitude towards painting,<sup>3</sup> may perhaps be seen in the fact that at least two of his works were technical *tours de force*.<sup>4</sup> There is evidence that certain of his works had gained him a reputation as a painter of lascivious subjects.<sup>5</sup> He was in general a slow worker, and his paintings were mostly small. His work, then, was characterized by a command of colour, a carefulness of execution and, sometimes at least, by striking technical effects and by licentiousness; these qualities manifested themselves most frequently in paintings conceived on a small scale. It is scarcely to be doubted that even among those who recognized the excellence of Pausias' technique there were some who looked upon him as a painter of trifles. We possess indeed a remark attributed to the painter Nicias which even if it was not made precisely with the works of Pausias in view, is nevertheless clearly directed against paintings of the kind which was most characteristic of him: *Νικίας δ' ὁ ζωγράφος καὶ τοῦτο εὐθὺς ἔλεγεν εἶναι τῆς γραφικῆς τέχνης οὐ μικρὸν μέρος τὸ λαβόντα ὕλην εὐμεγέθῃ γράφειν, καὶ μὴ κατακερματίζειν τὴν τέχνην εἰς μικρά, οἷον ὀρνίθια ἢ ἄνθη, ἀλλ' ἵππομαχίας καὶ ναυμαχίας . . .* (Overbeck, no. 1825 = Demetr. *Eloc.* 76).

<sup>1</sup> Heinze's attempt to demonstrate this in his note ad loc. must be rejected since he misinterpreted part of the passage (Plin. *H.N.* xxxv. 127) on which his explanation rests: the concluding sentence, 'tabulas inde e publico omnis propter aes alienum civitatis addictas Scauri aedilitas Romam transtulit', is not concerned with the works of Pausias; it was the entire state collection of Sicyon which came to Rome.

<sup>2</sup> The sources for Pausias and his work will be found in J. Overbeck, *Die antiken Schriftquellen zur Geschichte der bildenden Künste bei den Griechen* (Leipzig, 1868), nos. 1760-3, to which E. Pfuhl, (*Malerei u. Zeichnung der Griechen* [Munich, 1923], § 800) notes that Plin. *H.N.* xxi. 4 should be added. For discussions see Pfuhl, § 796 ff.; G. Lippold, *R.E.* xviii. 2417 ff.; A. Rumpf, *Handbuch der Archäologie*, Lief. 6 (Munich, 1953), p. 132.

<sup>3</sup> A convincing characterization of the Sicyonian 'school' will be found in H. Bulle, *Eine Skenographie* (94. Winckelmannsprogramm der deutschen archäol. Gesellschaft zu Berlin [Berlin, 1934]), pp. 23 ff.

<sup>4</sup> In the *boum immolatio* Pausias depicted a

facing ox in black and without the use of high lights in such a way that an impression of its *amplitudo* was conveyed (Overbeck, no. 1760 = Plin. *H.N.* xxxv. 126 f.; cf. O. Brendel, *Röm. Mitt.* xlv [1930], pp. 217 ff.). In another painting Methe was shown drinking from a glass bowl with her face seen through the glass of the vessel (Overbeck, no. 1761 = Pausan. ii. 27. 3).

<sup>5</sup> See Fronto, ed. van den Hout, i. 131: 'quid si Parrhasium versicolora pingere iuberet aut Apellen unicolora . . . aut lascivia Euphranorem aut Pausiam (ristiti) a sa<tura>?'

Athenaeus speaks of a painter called Pausanias as a *πορνογράφος* and gives as his source a work by Polemon on paintings in Sicyon (Overbeck, no. 1762 = Athen. xiii. 567 b). It is generally, and correctly, believed that the reference is to Pausias (see in particular Pfuhl, § 798). Lippold thinks that *πορνογράφος* means no more than 'painter of heterae' (*R.E.* xviii. 2418), but even if his view were correct, the evidence of *lascivia* in Fronto shows that licentiousness was a characteristic of Pausias' work.



Let us turn now to Davus. He is a slave with little refinement. The coarseness of his nature is clear from the language which he uses when he speaks of his sexual life (46-52). His lack of taste and judgement may be gauged by the effect which the words spoken by the *ianitor* of Crispinus (45), that Crispinus whom Horace elsewhere calls *ineptus* (*Sat.* i. 3. 138 f.), have had on him. In art he likes a realistic representation of a subject that appeals to his coarse nature, a gladiatorial fight (96 ff.). The technically accomplished, careful and decorative work of Pausias which, as we have seen, even a professional painter might find unsatisfactory because of its pettiness would appeal little to such a man as Davus. It is indeed difficult to suppose that Horace, in choosing an artist about his enthusiasm for whom Davus might speak with contempt, could have found one more suitable than Pausias.<sup>1</sup>

On general grounds, therefore, the reference to a *Pausica tabella* is most appropriate. But we can go farther than this. A prominent theme in Davus' speech is enslavement to sensuality (46-74, 89-94). In the lines which immediately precede the passage under discussion Davus speaks of Horace's being enslaved to a woman (89-92) and then goes on to make reference to the *dominus* to whom he is subject, his own sensuality (93 f.). The reference to a painting by Pausias, coming directly after this, would doubtless bring to the minds of many readers those obscene paintings with which the name of Pausias was associated and cause them to believe that Davus is still concerned with the theme of Horace's sensuality. Only later does it become clear that 95 does not refer to that, but forms the beginning of a new section in which Davus attacks Horace's passion for works of art. This procedure, in which a new theme is introduced in such a way that there is good reason for believing that the poet is still concerned with that which precedes, may be paralleled elsewhere in Horace.<sup>2</sup>

Queen's University of Belfast

M. J. McGANN

## AMMIANEA

MANY writers have shown how heavily Ammianus Marcellinus was accustomed to draw upon earlier authors in the wording of his history. Professor Fletcher has given a list of work done on this subject (*Rev. de Phil.* iii [1937], 377 ff.), and

<sup>1</sup> Heinze believed that Horace's source in this passage was Cic. *Parad.* 5. 37: 'Aëtionis tabula te stupidum detinet'. Although this is by no means certain (Lejay adopts a cautious attitude to the question, *Satires d'Horace* [Paris, 1911], pp. 541, 559), it may be worth pointing out that a contemptuous reference in Davus' mouth to a painting by Aëtion would not be as appropriate as is the reference to a *Pausiaca tabella*. Among the small number of titles of paintings by Aëtion of which we hear (probably four or five—the interpretation of the list in Overbeck, no. 1937 = Plin. *H.N.* xxxv. 78 is doubtful) two, the 'Marriage of Alexander and Roxane' (Overbeck, no. 1948 = Lucian, *Herodotus* s. *Aëtion* 4 f.) and another in which the fabu-

lous Semiramis was depicted and which seems to have been concerned with her dramatic rise to queenly power (Overbeck, no. 1937), have about them an air of the romantic and the exotic. In the sources dealing with Pausias there appears to be no mention of paintings in which incidents from history or mythology were depicted. The element of story-telling which we find in the two paintings by Aëtion and which may well have been absent from the work of Pausias would have appealed strongly to a naïve man like Davus.

<sup>2</sup> U. Knoche, *Philol.* xc (1935), 372 ff., 469 ff.; Fr. Klingner, *ibid.*, 467 f. See also *Rh. Mus.* xcvi (1954), 356 f.



has added many new examples of parallel passages from twenty-two authors. I give a few comments on the text of Ammianus, arising out of such parallels.<sup>1</sup>

(1) xiv. 6. 10: 'nec opibus nec victu nec indumentorum vilitate gregariis militibus discrepantes' (text of C. U. Clark: Berlin, 1910-15).

The writer in *T.L.L.* s.v. *discrepare* (v. 1. 1347. 50) takes *militibus* as dative. This construction with *discrepare* is much less common than *ab* and ablative, which Amm. uses at xxi. 7. 3 and xxii. 5. 4. (He has the word only once more, at xv. 11. 1, where *discrepantes* is used absolutely.) There may be a reminiscence here of Tacitus *Hist.* ii. 5 *cibo fortuito, veste habituque vix a gregario milite discrepans*, where the preposition is used. This book of Tacitus is well known to Amm. (On Amm. and Tacitus see Fletcher, pp. 389 ff. and literature there cited.) See, for example, *Hist.* ii. 1 *struebat iam fortuna in diversa parte terrarum initia causasque imperio* and Amm. xxii. 1. 1 *dum haec in diversa parte terrarum, fortunae struunt volubiles casus*; *Hist.* ii. 2 *his ac talibus inter spem metumque iactatum* and Amm. xx. 11. 31 *his ac talibus imperator inter spem metumque iactabatur*, xxi. 13. 1 *his ac talibus . . . inter spem metumque*. *a* could very easily drop out (as Clark believes it to have done from the best manuscript V at xv. 10. 11, xxi. 6. 7, xxi. 13. 11, xxiv. 1. 7, xxiv. 2. 9, xxv. 6. 10, xxviii. 5. 11). Moreover, the early editions of Erasmus (b) and Gelenius (G) have here *a gregariis*. The reading of G deserves attention, since Gelenius used the Hersfeldensis, which has been shown by Robinson to be the source of V, but which is now almost entirely lost.<sup>2</sup> The evidence is not conclusive, since Amm. often sought to vary his own vocabulary and constructions, as is shown especially by Hagendahl, *Studia Ammianea* (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1921), chapter iv, 'De Variatione Sermonis'. Sometimes, too, he changed the expressions which he borrowed: see, for example, Meurig Davies, *Latomus*, vii (1948) 219, on Amm. xxxi. 4. 6; Hagendahl, *op. cit.*, p. 134; and my note on xiv. 10. 2. Nevertheless, the indications are cumulative, and suggest that the preposition should be retained here.

(2) xiv. 10. 2: 'popularium quondam turbela discerpti.'

Petschenig's conjecture *popularium* (*Philol.* 1 [1891], 338-9) is accepted by Clark for *populari ut* of V. Amm. may have had in mind Apuleius *Met.* vii. 1 *turbelis popularium*. (On Amm. and Apuleius see Fletcher, pp. 393-4.) For a change of number cf. Apul. *Met.* viii. 4 *sollertis disciplinae memores*, Amm. xxvii. 6. 9 *studiis disciplinarum sollertium*; Apul. *Met.* x. 5 *aerumna funeris*, Amm. xxxi. 1. 4 *funerum aerumnas*.

(3) xx. 9. 6: 'Leonas . . . postridie principi progresso in campum . . . et tribunali (ut emeretur altius) superstanti scripta iubetur offerre.'

Rolfe (Loeb ed., vol. ii, 1936) unaccountably reads *e tribunali* with N. V has *in*, corrected by a contemporary hand to *et*. *e* can be explained as arising from *et* by haplography; *et* then connects *progresso* and *superstanti*.

(4) xxii. 16. 24: 'id autem notum est . . . quod Aegyptus omnis sub amicis eras antea regibus. aridiorem Libyam supremo Apionos regis consecuti sumus

<sup>1</sup> I gratefully acknowledge financial assistance from the Central Research Fund of the University of London in the preparation of these notes.

<sup>2</sup> On the possible independent value of G see Clark, *Text Tradition of A.M.*, New

Haven, 1904; R. P. Robinson, *The Hersfeldensis and the Fuldensis of A.M.*, Univ. of Missouri Studies, vol. xi, no. 3 (1936), pp. 118 and 140; G. B. Pighi, *A.M. Capita Selecta*, Neuchâtel (1948), Introd. pp. xvii and xix.

arbitrio, Cyrenas cum residuis civitatibus Libyae Pentapoleos, Ptolomaei liberalitate suscepimus.'

Rolfe (Loeb ed., vol. ii, 1936) reads *sub avitis* . . . *regibus*, accepting Petschenig's conjecture *avitis*,<sup>1</sup> which Clark records (Corrigenda, vol. ii. 1, p. vi) but does not admit into his text. Meurig Davies (*Emendations of A.M.* ii [Oxford, 1946], 5) suggests *antiquis*, quoting Cic. *de leg. agr.* ii. 57, where *amicissimis* is found in the manuscripts, but a conjecture *antiquissimis* preferred by the editor of the Oxford text. Rolfe mentions the similarity in language between Amm. and Rufius Festus, *Breviarium* 13, which he quotes in part in his note; but he seems not to have observed the full extent of the parallel, which was given, as Professor Fletcher points out to me, by Valesius in 1636: *Cyrenas cum ceteris civitatibus Libyae Pentapolis Ptolomaei antiquioris liberalitate suscepimus. Libyam supremo Appionis regis arbitrio sumus adsecuti. Aegyptus omnis sub amicis regibus fuerat* . . . (text of Wagener, Leipzig, 1886). Thus Festus has *amicis*, as does V *Avitis* should be rejected.

(5) xxiii. 5. 8 *incerto flatu fortunae* (*fatu* V; *fato* [given in Loeb app. crit. as *facto*] W<sup>m2</sup>BG).

Michael (*De A.M. Studiis Ciceronianis* [Breslau, 1874], 37), following Kiessling (*Coniectanea Ammianae* [ind. schol. aest., Greifswald 1874], 6), reads *f(l)atu*, comparing Cic. *de off.* ii. 19 *cum prospero flatu eius* (sc. *fortunae*) *utimur* and Amm. xvi. 1. 1 *si adfuisset (fortuna) flatu tandem secundo* and xxxi. 13. 19 *reflante Fortuna*. We need look no farther than Val. Max. vi. 9 *ext. 7 incertissimo flatu fortunae*, from which this is probably taken. Fletcher (op. cit., p. 386) gives some new examples of parallels from Val. Max. and refers to other work on Amm. and Val. Max. To these examples we may add Val. Max. i. 8. 6 *odio incitatissimo* and Amm. xxx. 5. 4 *incitato odio* where, as in the passage under consideration, Val. Max. uses the superlative of the adjective, while Amm. uses the positive (see Hagendahl, p. 134 and the example given there from Val. Max. vii. 2 *ext. 11*; cf. Justin i. 9. 14 *in coniecturis sagacissimo* and Amm. xxxi. 3. 6 *in coniectura sagaces* but, by contrast, Cic. *Acad.* ii. 89 *incitato furore*<sup>2</sup> and Amm. xxxi. 2. 11 *furori incitatissimo*, where a positive in Cic. becomes a superlative in Amm.); Val. Max. iii. 2. *ext. 3 assignatam sibi a patria stationem* and Amm. xv. 8. 14 *assignatam tibi ab ipsa republica stationem*; Val. Max. vi. 4. 5 (of Brutus) *omnem nominis sui memoriam inexpressibili detestatione perfudit* and Amm. xviii. 4. 5 (of Domitian) *memoriam nominis sui inexpressibili detestatione perfudit*; Val. Max. ix. 8. 2 *vix . . . sine animi horrore* and Amm. xxix. 1. 38 *vix sine animorum horrore*; and perhaps also Val. Max. ix. 15. 6 *multo fortius ille qui* . . . and Amm. xvi. 5. 4 *sed multo hic fortius. ille namque* . . .

(6) xxvii. 3. 9: 'eaeque vi territus ipse, primitiis crebriscentis seditionis in maius' (*premitus* V, *primitus* V<sup>m3</sup>, *fremituque* G, *primitus* EA, *primitiis* Petschenig).

Although Tacitus, *Hist.* i. 39 *iam exterritus Piso fremitu crebrescentis seditionis*, was quoted by Woelfflin (*Philol.* xxix [1870], 558), he merely queried *primitus* and sought by the text of Amm. to confirm the reading *crebrescentis* in Tac.

<sup>1</sup> This and other conjectures are contained in an index to Amm. compiled, I understand, by Petschenig, but never published. Clark refers to such conjectures as 'in indice'. I am

indebted to Professor Fletcher for this information.

<sup>2</sup> Fletcher, op. cit., p. 381; Michael, op. cit., p. 32, gave this as being quoted by Wagner in his ed. of 1808.

against a conjecture *crescentis*. The two passages were again compared by Cornelius (*Quomodo Tacitus, historiarum scriptor, in hominum memoria versatus sit*, etc. [Progr. Wetzlar 1888], p. 18), but only to show the parallel *crebrescentis seditionis*. Petschenig, without mentioning Tacitus and without discussion, proposed *primitis* (*Philol.* li [1892], 523). The true reading is *fremituque*, suggested by Tac. and preserved by Gelenius. The *-que* can then connect *ea . . . vi* (i.e. the attempt to burn Lampadius' house) and *fremitu . . . crebriscentis seditionis in maius* (i.e. the increasing unrest in general). The meaningless *primitus* of V preserves the vowel *e* and may still show the requisite number of letters, since *-que* was often written without the last two letters, as may be seen from the plates in Clark's edition and Robinson's article.<sup>1</sup> For the confusion of *f* and *p* in V, Mr. Meurig Davies very kindly reports the following: (*f* for *p*) xxiii. 6. 16, xxv. 1. 2, xxvi. 8. 15, xxvii. 12. 6, xxix. 1. 17, xxxi. 13. 12; (*p* for *f*) xiv. 6. 9, xiv. 7. 16, xxix. 3. 9; and suggests that the *p* of the preceding *ipse* may have helped to cause this error.

Professor Fletcher tells me that *fremituque* was first printed by Gelenius in 1533, and then appeared in editions of 1591, 1609, and 1636; but I have nowhere been able to find any reason given for accepting or rejecting it.

Greenford Grammar School, Middlesex

E. E. L. OWENS

<sup>1</sup> See note 2, p. 100.

### AESCHYLUS: *PERSAE* 647-8

ἡ φίλος ἀνὴρ, φίλος ὄχθος  
φίλα γὰρ κέκευθεν ἡθῆ.

In spite of Dr. Murray's 'ἀνὴρ Burney vix recte', we surely must, as Wilamowitz does, accept this emendation, if only on metrical grounds. ἀνὴρ does, while ἀνὴρ does not, correspond with ἀνδρας of l. 652; ἀνὴρ does, while ἀνὴρ does not, give any recognizable metre—here clearly choriambic. The article is necessary from a grammatical point of

view also. ἡ is an affirmative particle and should introduce a statement, even though the verb is not expressed. This line must mean, 'verily dear <is> the man, dear <is> the tomb'. If this much is granted, as I think it must be, should we not read ἀνὴρ . . . οὐθῆος? The crasis of ὁ ὁ-, though rare, is occasionally found in tragedy, e.g. οὐδυσσεύς (*Soph. Phil.* 572).

MAURICE PLATNAUER

Brasenose College, Oxford

### AIRS, WATERS, PLACES 16

THE author is considering possible reasons why Asiatics are less warlike than Europeans. He finds the chief cause in the equableness of the climate, a second in political conditions (οἱ νόμοι), that is to say, in the prevailing despotism. 'Where', he says, 'men are not self-governing and independent but ruled despotically, they do not take thought how to become good soldiers but how to appear lacking in military qualities, because the hazards' (of the warlike) 'are disproportionate' (to the hazards of the unwarlike). He proceeds to develop the assertion, that it does not pay to show military qualities under a despotism. (Consideration of the hazards of the warlike, introduced in the next sen-

tence with a μέν, is not in fact balanced by a consideration of the hazards of the unwarlike; and there is, accordingly, no answering δέ.) 'The warlike must needs fight and endure and die on their masters' behalf far away from young children, wife, and all they hold dear. When they perform fine and brave deeds, it is their masters who wax great, and indeed owe their position as despots to such achievements, but the soldiers' reward is danger and death.' Then follows a passage containing textual difficulties.

ἐνὶ δὲ πρὸς τούτοις τῶν τοιούτων ἀνθρώπων ἀνάγκη ἐρημοῦσθαι τὴν γῆν ὑπὸ τε ἀπολεμίων (V: πολεμίων B) καὶ ἀργίης ὥστε καὶ εἰ τις φύσει πέφυκεν ἀνδρείος καὶ εὐψυχος ἀποτρέ-

πασθαι τὴν γνώμην ἀπὸ (ὑπὸ Gad.) τῶν νόμων. The emendations proposed in the first half of the passage are unsatisfactory. ἀπολεμίων, the reading of the oldest manuscript V, is a *hapax legomenon*. ἀπολεμίων could mean 'repeated examples of unwarlikeness', but, since repeated examples of unwarlikeness, when the men are away campaigning, cannot be said to result in the land going to waste, Zwinger (who alters ἀπολεμίων to ἀπολεμῆς) emends ἐρημοῦσθαι τὴν γῆν drastically to ἡμεροῦσθαι τὴν ὀργήν. And Heiberg accepts this text in the *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum*. W. H. S. Jones (Loeb edition, vol. i) is more cautious, and adopts for ἀπολεμίων the easy correction πολεμίων which is the reading of the sixteenth- or seventeenth-century Barberinus. But the author is saying that foreign service resulted in the land going to waste. Foreign service could not cause it to be devastated 'by ene-

mies', or, at any rate, only very indirectly.

There is one way by which foreign service directly results in the land going to waste: viz. through lapse of cultivation (ἀργία, cf. Theophrastus, *C.P.* iv. 5. 6.). Lapse of cultivation occurs through the absence (ἀποδημία), and is consolidated through the repeated absences (ἀποδημῖαι), of the cultivators on military service. I propose accordingly to emend ΑΠΟΛΕΜΙΩΝ to ΑΠΟΔΗΜΙΩΝ, and to translate (accepting Gadaldini's ὑπὸ for ἀπὸ, and placing a colon after ἀργίης) as follows:

'Furthermore, the land of men subject to such service must needs go to waste through their repeated absences abroad and the subsequent lapse of cultivation. We may say accordingly that men naturally brave and spirited are discouraged by political conditions.'

J. S. MORRISON

Trinity College, Cambridge

### PLUTARCH, *MORALIA*, 351 F

'Ἑλληνικὸν γὰρ ἡ Ἴσις ἐστὶ καὶ ὁ Τυφὼν πολέμιος <ὧν> τῇ θεῷ καὶ δι' ἀγνοίαν καὶ ἀπάτην τετυφωμένος καὶ διασπῶν καὶ ἀφανίζων τὸν ἱερὸν λόγον, ὃν ἡ θεὸς συνάγει καὶ συντίθησι καὶ παραδίδωσι τοῖς τελουμένοις. . . .

The expression used of Typhon, διασπῶν καὶ ἀφανίζων τὸν ἱερὸν λόγον, is a strange one. Hopfner translates 'der . . . die heilige Lehre zerstückelt und vernichtet', and it is true that Plutarch says (352 b) of the devotees of Isis that they bear in their hearts τὸν ἱερὸν λόγον περὶ θεῶν; he also represents Isis as portraying her experiences in the form of an εὐσεβείας διδασκαλία (361 e). But he does not speak of Typhon opposing this. In fact the teaching about Typhon and Osiris is a part of the sacred lore according to 353 d.

Babbitt in his Loeb translation attempts to be more concrete: 'He tears to pieces and scatters to the winds the sacred writings, which the goddess collects and puts together and gives into the keeping of those who are initiated into the holy rites. . . .' But it is doubtful whether λόγος can bear this meaning.<sup>1</sup> More serious still is the fact that there is nothing in Plutarch's exposition of the myth which refers to such an incident; nor do his various allegorical explanations give any countenance to the abstract interpretation of the other translators.

The name Isis is presumably connected in the context with εἰδέναι, and ἀγνοία is attri-

buted to Typhon. The other phrases used of him, πολέμιος τῇ θεῷ and δι' . . . ἀπάτην τετυφωμένος, suggest an allusion to the myth itself. What Typhon does tear to pieces and scatter, according to the myth, is the body of Osiris, and Isis is said to gather the pieces together. In one passage (373 a) which refers to this episode, it is noteworthy that the same verbs are used of Typhon's action as in the passage under discussion: μυθολογοῦσι τὴν Ὀσίριδος ψυχὴν αἰδίων εἶναι καὶ ἀθάρατον, τὸ δὲ σῶμα πολλάκις διασπᾶν καὶ ἀφανίζειν τὸν Τυφῶνα, τὴν δ' Ἴσιν πλανουμένην καὶ ζητεῖν καὶ συναρμόττειν πάλιν. For λόγον, therefore, in our passage I propose to read νεκρόν. Compare, for the phrase ἱερὸς νεκρός, the mention of ἱερὸν σῶμα in *Moralia* 1117 d-e; cf. also 375 d and 382 e.

It is said elsewhere (358 a) that Isis honoured the recovered parts of the body of Osiris or distributed images of him, ὡς τὸ σῶμα διδοῦσαν; cf. 359 a-b where the body of the god is associated with his shrines. That the reference in our passage is to Osiris is confirmed by the subsequent mention of ἡ τοῦ πρώτου καὶ κυρίου καὶ νοητοῦ γνώσις. This deity is described as 'with her (Isis) and in close converse';<sup>2</sup> in 355 e Osiris is said to have been born first and he is called ὁ πάντων κύριος.

J. GWYN GRIFFITHS

University College of Swansea

<sup>1</sup> In 353 d the phrase ἱερὸς λόγος denotes a 'sacred reason' to explain the priests' abstention from fish. This meaning does not suit

our passage.

<sup>2</sup> Sieveking, however, brackets these words.

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW  
VIRGIL, *AENEID*, xii. 451

Ille volat campoque atrum rapit agmen  
aperto.  
451 qualis ubi ad terras abrupto sidere  
nimbus  
it mare per medium . . .

'I seem', said Warde Fowler, 'able to make out Virgil's picture all except the words *abrupto sidere*.' Servius explained the phrase thus: 'per sidus tempestas significatur', and this has been almost universally accepted ('*abrumpi sidus* erit *abrumpi* turbine et tempestatem', Cerda; '*abrupto sidere*, magnifice pro abrupta nube quae nimbum, procellam, facit', Heyne; '*sidere*, nube et procella', Wagner; and so Conington, Page, Lejay, Mackail, Maguinness: the normal translation is 'when a storm breaks').

Now if this metonymy of *sidus* = *nimbus*, *procella*, were possible, the use of *abrumpere* in *Geo.* iii. 259 *abruptis procellis* (cf. *Aen.* iii. 199 *abruptis nubibus*, *Aen.* ii. 416 *rupto turbine*) would be a convincing parallel. But there is no evidence at all to suggest that it is possible. Of course in certain contexts the words can approximate in meaning (*Geo.* i. 311, *Aen.* xi. 259 f.; a good example in *Ov. Met.* 5. 281 f. *grave sidus et imbrem vitare*), but in all these instances the proper meaning of *sidus* is present, and I do not find any passage which would indicate that the metonymy of *sidus* can go so far that its proper meaning is forgotten. Peerlkamp saw this, and commented (ad loc.): '*Sidus* significat semper *astrum*, deinde certum anni tempus quo oritur vel occidit et tempestatem movet, denique sumitur pro ipsa tempestate. Propria autem significatio ita servatur, ut non omnia de *sidere* dicas, quae dici possunt de tempestate. Recte navigamus hiberno sidere, ferimus et timemus triste sidus, sidus fluctus asperat, similia. Sed nemini, nedum Virgilio, in mentem venire potuit, ut scriberet: *sidus abrum-*

*pitur, rumpitur*, ut *nubes, caelum abrumpitur*.' Peerlkamp, needless to say, solved the problem by emending: he proposed *abruptus ab aethere*.

Warde Fowler's suggestion was that 'the heaven (*sidus*) was torn down like a curtain to let the rain or hail descend'. But this hardly fits *sidus* better than the other explanation. Ovid (*Fast.* ii. 495) has *abrumpitur ignibus aether*, Silius (vi. 608) *abrupto caelo*, but the metonymy of *sidus* with *aether* or *caelum* is equally subject to the limitations discussed above.

The true explanation, I think, is found in a passage in Statius, possibly a reminiscence of Virgil's phrase: *Th.* i. 325 (referring to the supernatural darkness sent upon guilty Mycenae) *caligantes abrupto sole Mycenae*. Barth here explains *abrupto* as *interrupto*, rightly as we see from *Th.* ii. 184 (referring to the same occasion) *non fugeret diras lux intercisca Mycenae*. The use of *abrumpere* is not far removed from the common *abrumpere somnos, vocem, vitam*. For *sidus* meaning the sun (as of course it can) cf. *Ov. A.A.* i. 724 *a radiis sideris esse niger*, *Ov. Met.* i. 424 *aetharioque recens exarsit sidere limus* (where see Lee's note). In support of this interpretation it may be added that in the Homeric simile which Virgil closely follows (*Il.* iv. 275 f.) there is no mention of a storm breaking out: the blackness, however, is a main point of the simile, comparison being made between the onset of *φάλαγγες κυάεαι* and *νέφος μέλαν-τερον ἤντε πύσσα*. In the same way Virgil returns in his simile with the phrase *abrupto sidere* to the idea of blackness in *astrum agmen*. Translate then: 'like a storm cloud which cuts off the sun's light and moves landwards over mid-ocean . . .'.

R. D. WILLIAMS

University of Reading

## REVIEWS

THE *TRACHINIAE* AND *ANTIGONE* OF SOPHOCLES

Sophocle, Tome i: *Les Trachiniennes, Antigone*. Texte établi par A. DAIN, et traduit par P. MAZON. (Collection Budé.) Pp. lxii+225 (double). Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1955. Paper.

THE new Budé Sophocles is the joint work of two distinguished French scholars, A. Dain and P. Mazon, the former being responsible for the text, the latter for the translation, with constant co-operation at all stages. Masqueray's edition, which it supersedes, was completed in 1924, and the intervening years have seen much research, notably by A. Turyn, into the conditions of the textual tradition of Sophocles (though less has been done for the text itself). There are to be three volumes, the second containing the Byzantine Select Choice (*Aj.*, *O.T.*, *El.*) and the third *Phil.* and *O.C.* (The *Ichneutae* is to be omitted, as more suitable for inclusion in an edition of the fragments.) Thus, if the *Trachiniae* is accepted, as it reasonably can be, as an early play, the grouping is also roughly chronological, though no stress is laid upon this. There is a general introduction on Sophocles' life and work by Mazon, and on the textual tradition by Dain; each play is also prefaced, after the usual pattern in this series, by a 'notice'. These are short and good, especially the argument against Euripidean influence in *Trach.* The text of the Hypotheses, omitted in the older edition, is now included.

Dain gives a lucid and excellent summary of the textual tradition, distinguishing three families of manuscripts, the prototypes of all of which go back to the fifth or sixth century, being descended from a common ancestor, a recension of the seven select plays made in the second century. Most of this tradition is contained within the compass of L, but it is necessary to investigate all the rest in order to distinguish the various stages of accumulation on the original L, and here Dain's own studies have added precision to our knowledge. He gives reasons for supposing L itself to have been copied from an uncial manuscript dated a little before 500. He uses the recently discovered Leyden palimpsest (P) as an occasional support for the original readings of L under the erasures of the scribe of A (L<sup>a</sup>). Of the second, not very important, family of three late manuscripts descended from a prototype very like L's, only Vat. gr. 2291 (R), not hitherto used by editors, is relevant to these two plays. Of the importance of A (of the third family) as an independent authority, so long the subject of controversy, Dain has no doubt; he instances *λεωπάτηρον* *Ant.* 1275 as a rare and valid formation which could not possibly have been a philologist's correction of *λακπάτηρον*. Whether *λακπάτηρον* was a common enough adjective to have been intended as a correction of *λεωπάτηρον* may also be doubted; it is perhaps more likely that both are very old variants.

Since the Budé edition is intended primarily for readers, the apparatus has been kept short. The interrelations of the tradition are given fairly fully, omitting unimportant details of orthography and the blunders or bad conjectures in late manuscripts. This supplies the material available for reconstituting the recension from which all our tradition comes and in the precision



with which this is done the edition marks a considerable advance. Whether the reader has been so well served by the paucity of admitted conjecture is more doubtful; it is of course a principle often followed in a short apparatus to record only those conjectures which have been adopted in the text, but where the editing is so conservative as here some relaxation might have been allowed. To take a few examples: *Tr.* 66 *φέρει* is grammatical but *φέρειν* surely more appropriate; 675 *ἀργῆτ'* in this position can only have been adopted in the tradition on the assumption that it stood for *ἀργῆτι*; 907-11 were seen by Wecklein to be an intrusion from a totally different situation and are not to be improved by tinkering with a word or two of the text; 1046 the fact that Cicero read *λόγω κακά* does not make it better sense; *Ant.* 1219 *ἐξ ἀθύμου δεσπότου κελεύσματος* without an article is dubious enough to call for a mention of the more straightforward *-ματων*; 1241 A's *εἰν Αἰδου δόμοις* is a conjecture feeble enough to deserve some alternative.

Different scholars will naturally give different answers to the question whether in any given instance a peculiar expression could be Sophoclean Greek or not, and where acceptance is in line with the majority of past editors, as in *Tr.* 338 *τούτων ἔχω γὰρ πάντ' ἐπιστήμην ἐγώ*, the sceptic cannot reasonably complain at the absence of comment; on the other hand a phrase like *ἄτης ἅτερ* (*Ant.* 4) which has been suspect from Didymus downwards, does seem to need a note, if not an obelus. There are passages where the Greek is almost impossible to construe, like *Tr.* 1062 *θῆλυς οὔσα κοῦκ ἀνδρὸς φύσιν* (*κάνανδρος* Jackson), 1160 *πρὸς τῶν πνεόντων μηδενὸς θανεῖν ὑπο*; and others where the translation offered is no defence for the received text, for instance the fut. opt. *ἐγκλήσοι* *Ant.* 505 rendered by 'si la peur ne devait leur fermer la bouche'; whatever one thinks of the solution offered for the intractable passage *Tr.* 1018-19, to retain *βίотου τοιαῦτα* 1022 as 'ces épreuves de l'existence' seems a heavy price to pay to avoid so simple an emendation as *βίотον*. At *Tr.* 843 ff. neither 'la brusque arrivée d'une épouse nouvelle' nor 'il est des choses qu'elle n'a pas comprises' seems more than a desperate effort to foist sense upon *νέων αἰσούντων γάμων* and *τὰ μὲν οὔτι προσέβαλε*. On the other hand, the *βάσις* of codd. *Tr.* 964 will seem to many a better word than Meineke's *στάσις*.

With so little room allowed to conjecture, the editors have limited their own contribution to a few minor points of orthography and respension. Dain is very likely right in assuming that *Tr.* 1004-17 responds to 1024-43. In 972, where, as he says, the metre limps, why not read *μέλεος σοῦ*, making two consecutive paroemiacs? It is disappointing to find further support given to the notion that οὔτ' ἀκάματοι θεῶν *Ant.* 607 could respond to *εἰδοῖτι δ' οὐδέν ἔρπει*. Nothing more is done to clear up the confusion of the kommos *Tr.* 876-95, where question and answer continually elude each other, and a talking *Τρόφος* is left with a sudden burst of lyric solo *στονοέντος ἐν τομῇ σιδάρου*.

The most striking innovation is the manner of setting out the lyrics, with each stanza divided into internal periods. These are not the same as 'verse'-units, nor do they necessarily coincide with metrical pause or change of metre. How they are determined is not here stated, but we are told that it is not on mere subjective appreciation but on the observation of rules, some of them peculiar to himself, which Sophocles demonstrably follows. In any lyric sequence, for instance, each stanza contains the same number of periods. Judgement on this must wait on a statement of the method of determination; in the meantime it may be said that there is some practical convenience for the reader and that



most of the divisions look *a priori* reasonable. Occasional doubts arise, however: one suspects that the improbable trochaic trimeters in *Tr.* 132 ff. are dragged in because if syncopated iambics were carried all through it would be too obvious that the natural division of the epode was into two periods, not three to match the other stanzas. Space does not allow here a discussion of various innovations in the colometry of these plays.

The translation is of the kind usual in this series; it is far less literal than Jebb and makes no attempt to reproduce the concentration of the original, but reads agreeably and is immediately intelligible. Here and there one might query a point: *Tr.* 307 *τίς ποτ' ἐλ νεανίδων*; is not 'quies-tu parmi ces jeunes filles?'; 491 (with n.) is ruinously misconceived; can *Ant.* 536 *εἴπερ ἦδ' ὁμορροθεῖ* mean 'puisqu'elle-même avoue'? On *Tr.* 100 *ποντίας αὐλῶνας* see now Lloyd-Jones in *C.Q.* iv (1954), 91. One might also question the implications of some of the stage-directions—'sortent du gynécée', for instance, or 'Créon, portant le corps de son fils dans ses bras'.

Birkbeck College, London

A. M. DALE

## CONCORDANCE TO EURIPIDES

JAMES T. ALLEN and GABRIEL ITALIE: *A Concordance to Euripides*. Pp. xi+686. Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1954. Cloth, 75s. net.

THE making of a completely new word-index to a major classical author is normally too heavy a task for the individual scholar, unless he takes over material already accumulated by a previous worker in the same field. The enterprise needs not only a guiding hand, but competent assistants—and, of course, adequate financial support. All these essentials were available in the preparation of this fine concordance, but even so its publication now, over fifty years after the work was begun, is a triumph of patient scholarship over great difficulties.

Professor J. T. Allen of the University of California, whose lifework this was, had with his helpers completed the preliminary operations of assembling and sorting references, and had compiled several hundred pages of the manuscript, when Dr. Italie of the Hague announced in 1938 that he had finished after thirteen years the collecting of material for a lexicon to Euripides. The correspondence which followed led to an arrangement that Italie should prepare instead the second half of this concordance, but the German invasion of Holland interrupted his labours and severed contact between the two editors. By 1945, when contact was renewed, Allen had completed his half and gone on to the second, working backwards from  $\Omega$ . Italie is therefore responsible only for the letters *AMNO*. Unhappily Allen's death in 1948 prevented him from seeing the work through the press. The editorial readers at Berkeley and Oxford (where the printing was done), faced with many problems through this removal of the master hand, wisely avoided any alterations beyond the correction of 'obvious errors of transliteration, arrangement, or reference'.

That all this labour was well spent will be agreed by every scholar concerned with Greek drama, or indeed with the Greek language itself. Beck's *Index accuratus et copiosus* to Euripides, in spite of the claims made in its title, was far

from complete and was based on faulty texts. Matthiae's *Lexicon Euripideum* (1841) dealt with only *A* to *Γ*, and thereafter no considerable work appeared in this field until Nauck's *Tragicæ Dictionis Index* in 1892. Later attempts at an index or lexicon for Euripides have failed to reach publication, or covered only part of the alphabet. Meanwhile much fresh material has come forward in papyrus fragments, many of them discovered while the Concordance was being prepared. In dealing with the problem of what to include, which this new material raised even more sharply than the old, the editors have cast their net widely, retaining the *Rhesus* and passages often excised as interpolations, although references to the latter are sometimes in square brackets. Many tiny papyrus fragments are omitted, and a few longer ones (listed in the Introduction) which one scholar or another has attributed to Euripides. Otherwise everything has been included which was available by 1948.

Within these limits the work of index-making has been pursued with great diligence and accuracy. There are three points on which the result seems open to criticism, and to suffer from defects which arise partly, but only partly, from the lack of final revision.

First, the question of the number of references to be given under each head. The editors rightly claim that 'to cite every instance in an author's works of δέ, καί, and the like, and even of some others, is wasteful pedantry'; and much time and space have been saved by the use of *et passim*, etc., or *κατὰ*. In ten lines taken at random, only 42 words were cited out of a total of 63. But there are some words—nouns like *παῖς*, *πατήρ*, or *χθών*, for example—where it is rather surprising to find this practice applied; and the application of it seems inconsistent. *τις*, with its various forms, receives just over a column, and *τις* indefinite (wrongly printed with an accent) rather less. Yet *ὅδε* has 15 columns, and the definite article 30. It would have been valuable to give statistics of the occurrences of words for which not all the references are cited.

Second, the longer articles involve a problem of classification, of imposing order and clarity on a mass of material, the solution of which is of great importance for speedy use of such a concordance. Where possible, 'the classification is based on form, declensional or conjugational, and the first quoted instance of each form is printed in full-face type'—an excellent system, which makes it easy to find quickly any part of any verb or noun or adjective. But there are many words, including some of the commonest, where this method cannot be applied, and the only possible classification is by usage and meaning; others, where both methods are desirable. In some instances in this volume (e.g. *εἰ*, *ἐπεὶ*, *μή*, *ὄχλος*, *ὥς*, *τάχα*) the grouping is indicated by figures and brief headings in Latin. But for others which require the same treatment it has not been done: we are left to grope our way through nine columns of *οὐ* with no more to guide us than light dashes between the unexplained subdivisions. More explanatory headings are needed in these cases, and the user's task would have been simplified if all numbers and headings of subdivisions had been printed in heavy type, as in Powell's *Lexicon to Herodotus*.

Last, but by no means least important, there is the question of the choice of text. The simplest and most usual course for the compiler of such a concordance is to follow a single standard version, such as the Oxford text, throughout. For the papyrus remains Allen and Italie have adopted a single text (mostly Page) in each case, as indicated in the Introduction. But their treatment of the complete plays 'is based not upon a single text . . . but upon the best texts from

Kirchhoff's to those of Murray and of Méridier, Parmentier, and Grégoire'. Variant readings are given, and although it is stated that 'conjectures are as a rule omitted', a host of proposed corrections are in fact quoted. All this has obviously added enormously to the labour involved, for not only must different readings and suggested emendations be collected, but judgements on their value must continually be made in order to decide which to include, and which to regard as correct. The editors have really produced not only an index, but a new text. The task appears to have been performed for the most part with good taste and sound judgement, but the wisdom of attempting it seems questionable. The reader is indeed presented with a rich store of information on the variant readings and the conjectures which have been put forward, but this he could obtain from an edition; and on the other hand he may feel that whether variants and conjectures should be mentioned or not the Concordance would be easier to use if one standard text were adopted as the guide to the headings under which words are to be cited. To take a single example, *Medea* 339:

τί δ' αὖ βιάζῃ κοῦκ ἀπαλλάσσει χθονός;

(δ' αὖ AVLB, accepted by Page: δ' οὖν P: δαι Housman, Murray: δῆ Elmsley; χθονός codd.: χερός Wilamowitz, Murray.)

The opening of the line is cited only under δαι, where the variant readings are also given, not under τί, δέ, αὖ, or οὖν. This is in accordance with Murray's Oxford text. Yet under βιάζω we find τί δ' αὖ (δαι Hous.) β. κοῦκ ἀπαλλάσσει χθονός (the comma after χθονός should be a question-mark); and the last three words are given under ἀπαλλάσσει as οὐκ ἀπαλλάσσει χθονός; The line is not mentioned under χερός, where no indication is given that the list of references is incomplete; nor under χθονός, but presumably it is covered by *et passim* there. Thus the user of the Concordance must start from the Oxford text for the beginning of the line, but not for the end. Yet ὑπερβαίνουσα, another Housman conjecture which Murray prints in *Medea* 382, is given only under ὑπερβαίνουσα (ὑπερβαίν- Hous.).

In this review more space has been devoted to pointing out imperfections than to praise. But these criticisms are of little importance compared with the fact that the editors have produced a volume which is a notable example of its kind, and likely to remain the standard index to Euripides for many years to come. Not least are we indebted to the printers of the Oxford University Press, who have here given us a fine specimen of their skill and accuracy. The type is large and clear, the size of the page generous. This handsome concordance should be on the shelves of every academic library. For individual scholars it is a luxury which all will covet, but which few, unfortunately, will be able to afford.

University of Southampton

H. C. BALDRY

## THE POLITICAL PLAYS OF EURIPIDES

GÜNTHER ZUNTZ: *The Political Plays of Euripides*. Pp. xi+157. Manchester: University Press, 1955. Cloth, 18s. net.

IN the first part of this book Dr. Zuntz discusses the interpretation of the *Suppliants* and *Heraklidae*, their relation to fifth-century history, and the date of their first production. He makes it clear that in calling these plays political he does

not mean that they should be interpreted as propaganda, but that 'problems of human fellowship have become the material for artistic creation'. Again, the *Supplikes* is 'not an allegory on current affairs but the self-contained reshaping of an Attic myth'. He recognizes of course that there are many passages in the plays which would be likely to make some spectators think of this or that incident of their own times, but he maintains that the political significance lies not in any specific allusions but in the impact of each play as a whole upon the audience. He is essentially right, I think, in his opposition to those scholars, such as E. Delebecque, who regard the introduction of propagandist allusions as a major preoccupation of Euripides, and he is often successful in showing that passages suspected of being introduced merely for the sake of an allusion are in fact fully justified on purely dramatic grounds, though I doubt whether all allusions to contemporary events and speculations are as thoroughly 'absorbed into the dramatic organism' as he maintains. So, too, in dating the plays Zuntz prefers not to rely on specific allusions but rather to consider the general purport of each play, and then to ask in what year the political and military atmosphere was suitable for such a play. On this, perhaps rather subjective, basis Zuntz argues persuasively for 430 for the *Heraklidae* and 424 for the *Supplikes*, dates which also fit the metrical evidence (see Ceardel in *C.Q.*, 1941, pp. 74, 75).

In comparison with other plays of Euripides neither of these two ranks very high in the estimation of most scholars, and it is well that we should have a study of them by one who admires them wholeheartedly and whose enthusiasm may have discovered aspects hidden from colder critics. Zuntz does not, however, convince me that the *Supplikes* is 'a great play', and I should demur to his suggestion that anyone who doubts this is dominated by Schlegel. It is a measure of the extreme differences of opinion provoked by some parts of the Euripidean corpus that of two good scholars one can say that the *Supplikes* is a great play, and the other (Norwood, *Essays on Euripidean Drama*, p. 153) that 'our *Supplikes* is not a "work" at all, but a heap of lumps thrown together by some meddling dullard'.

The point of view from which Zuntz approaches the interpretation of these plays is that the world of Euripides, as contrasted with that of Aeschylus and Sophocles, has been abandoned by the gods, and that in all his plays Euripides is searching for an answer to the question: 'how is man to live in a godless world?' In the *Supplikes* the question presents itself in the particular form: for what will the ideal democracy go to war? The answer is, in defence of the common laws of Hellas on the observance of which 'hinges the security, the dignity, the very existence of Athens and of all the Greek cities'. Of course the world of the *Supplikes* is by no means godless: throughout the play there are references to the traditional gods as the guardians of justice and morality. Zuntz meets this by explaining that though Euripides really thinks of the universe as 'boundless and comfortless', and of the gods as 'powerful impersonations of the uncontrollable forces that make mankind their sport', in this play, out of compassion for humanity, he imagines the world as 'a well-ordered whole, the life of which is safeguarded, for the good of man, by wholesome, rational laws'. This world order is identified with the dispensation of the traditional deities. Hence the unexpected optimism of Theseus and the unwonted confidence expressed in soothsayers (196-218).

This general view, expressed in language that is eloquent, if at times rather

rhetorical, enables Zuntz to account for certain disconcerting features of the play, but contains, I think, some difficulties. If Euripides has in fact built a play on the assumption that 'God's in his heaven, All's right with the world', this will hardly provide an answer to the question how to live in a world that is in the grip of forces uncontrollable and unpredictable. In any case does the play really leave as comforting an impression as Zuntz sometimes suggests? It might be argued that a theme of the play, if not *the* theme, is the misery inflicted by war, whatever the cause; and from this misery no relief is promised, since at the end we have Athena commanding the children of the dead to seek vengeance in the future. This sombre note, which Zuntz has not failed to observe, is sounded chiefly in the choral odes, which foreshadow what Kitto has called the 'mournful *ostinato*' of the lyrics in the *Trojan Women*. Does all this fit in with Zuntz's assertion that the universe of Euripides is tragic, but the slice of it presented in the *Supplikes* is not? Again, though Athens appears as champion of the weak, and the play may well be intended partly as an answer to the enemies of Athens, partly as a challenge to the Athenians themselves, I am not sure that in the treatment of Theseus and Athens the touches of irony characteristic of Euripides are as completely absent as Zuntz supposes. However, if I do not find Zuntz's account of the *Supplikes* wholly convincing, I must add that he clearly brings to bear on the interpretation of both plays good scholarship and a sensitive mind, and that on both he has much to say that is interesting and suggestive.

For reasons of space I must leave the chapter on the *Heraclidae*, with regret in passing that the author has not included here, with any necessary modifications, his well-reasoned article in *C.Q.* xlv (1947), since it is complementary to his present study, and it would have been convenient to have his views brought together in this volume.

The second part of the book contains a discussion of the scene of the *Heraclidae*, notes on nine selected passages dealing with details of text and interpretation, and a chapter on the nature and transmission of the Tragic Hypotheses. The total effect is perhaps rather scrappy, and it is not possible to discuss here Zuntz's detailed observations on a wide range of topics. It must be enough to say that his suggestions are based on sound scholarship and common sense and many are likely to be accepted; for instance, his transpositions in vv. 683-91 seem plausible and effective. Certainly any future editor of the play should not fail to study these pages. In the concluding chapter on the Hypotheses Zuntz distinguishes three main types, Aristophanic, Byzantine, and an intermediate type peculiar to the Euripidean manuscripts. C. Gallavotti ascribed this type to Dicaearchus, but, except for *Alc. I*, Zuntz rejects this ascription and considers that the evidence is insufficient to determine the authorship. In some of his views on the nature of these Hypotheses and their probable date, perhaps the first century B.C., he is substantially in agreement with Wilamowitz in *Analecta Euripidea*, but his results are clearly based on his own investigations, and the whole chapter bears witness to his wide learning and independence of judgement.

The book is well produced and printed, and I have noticed no misprints worth mentioning. On p. 85 n. 3 should read p. 87, and on p. 152 n. 2 the first reference should be *C.R.* lxii (1948). On p. 148 'the *Suda*' is (perhaps regretably) more familiar in this country in the form *suidas*.

## MARGINALIA SCAENICA

JOHN JACKSON: *Marginalia Scaenica*. Pp. ix+250. London: Oxford University Press, 1955. Cloth, 30s. net.

JOHN JACKSON died in 1952, and for the posthumous publication of this remarkable volume scholars are indebted to the kind offices of the editorial committee of 'Oxford Classical and Philosophical Monographs', and especially to the zeal and devoted labour of Professor Eduard Fraenkel, who extracted—and that is *le mot juste*—the manuscript from the modestly reluctant author, got it into shape, checked, and often supplied, the references, saw it through the press, and, finally, has written a preface to it. The method of the book's composition was as remarkable as are its contents. The greater part of Jackson's life was spent not in the studious seclusion of a university but in a remote village in the wilds of Cumberland, where he managed his mother's farm, his reading and writing being of necessity done on his return from the day's work. He was further inhibited by having no public library to which to go for new editions or books of reference, and by the fact that his own texts and commentaries were neither very numerous nor always up to date; yet he has produced a collected body of emendations the like of which, at least for brilliance and ingenuity, has not seen the light of day since the publication of Madvig's *Adversaria* and Cobet's *Variae* and *Novae Lectiones* more than a century ago. The book's title explains its contents: here are no less than 277 passages, mostly from the Attic Dramatists, discussed and emended; to be precise, 162 from Euripides, 43 from Sophocles, 31 from Aristophanes, and, for good measure, 41 from other miscellaneous authors. Of these emendations 58 had already appeared in *C.Q.* xxxv and these have been incorporated in this book; so that now the bulk of this scholar-farmer's critical writings, it may be said, ἐν τῇ μῇ μάνδρᾳ, ἐν τῇ μῇ ἀγέλᾳ. Besides all this are three sections of *addenda* dealing with, respectively, 'Unconscious Repetitions by the Poet', 'Unconscious Repetitions by the Copyist', and 'Transpositions'. Professor Fraenkel has added a General Index, an Index of words, and—indispensably—an *Index locorum*. It is this last which saves the book from what would otherwise be chaos. He has also done his best to classify the various emendations, so that the book starts with a chapter on 'Transposition of Verses, Words, and Letters', which is followed by one on 'Omissions and Glosses'. This takes us to p. 116. Next come 105 pages of 'Miscellanea'—classified as far as was possible under such headings as 'Obliteration of Parentheses', 'Punctuation', etc.—then the *addenda* mentioned above, then nine pages of 'Supplementary Notes', four pages of 'Longer Notes' (back references would have been useful here), and the indexes. The whole book is written in a most lively and provocative style reminding one by its wit of Housman's, but without its venom. It stands to reason that 277 emendations cannot all be palmary,<sup>1</sup> and if the reviewer singles out some with which he ventures to disagree, he hopes to be taken to mean that, at least in his opinion, the rest vary from the highly probable to the certain. But Jackson had a persuasive pen, and more conservative critics may well take a less favourable view.

To save space the emendations discussed will be given in the barest outline.

<sup>1</sup> *Exempli gratia* I would cite his ἐν ταύτῃ πένδου (for πένδω) at *Bacch.* 1220, which lurks modestly in a footnote. This partitive gen.

is not common; J. might have cited as a parallel Eur. *Phoen.* 38 ἐς ταύτων . . . ὀδοῦ.



This, though it will send the reader to his texts—unless he, as apparently Jackson did, knows the *Scaenici* by heart—seems inevitable.

P. 17 (*Bacch.* 756 ff.): Jackson excises ἐς μέλαν πέδον as an 'escape' from l. 1065, removes οὐ χαλκὸς οὐ σιδηρὸς to after 761, taking the words as in apposition to λογχωτὸν βέλος, and completes the line by <ἐνθεον χροά>. This has the advantage of supplying an object, χροά, to ἤμασσε, which in its absolute sense—'for them (τοῖς) weapons drew no blood'—is unparalleled and unlikely. ἐνθεον = ἱερόν or the like is, however, an unhappy epithet for χροά.

P. 35 (*I.T.* 830): Jackson has Ἀργόθεν <συνέντ'>, ὦ φίλος. Granted that a participle is wanted, as has long been realized, and granted also that the double -θεν- might have occasional haplography, yet the idea of 'haste' implied in συνέντα is out of place here.

P. 82 (*I.A.* 1207): in Jackson's εἰ δ' εὖ λέλεκται <πλείστα>, μὴ κτλ., πλείστα does not seem palaeographically likely, nor does it give good sense. Would Clytemnestra suggest merely that *most* of what she had said was well said?

P. 89 (*Eur. El.* 498): Jackson proposes ἄνθει for ὁσμῇ. The Old Man brings Electra a present of flowers (στεφάνους), cheese, and wine. True, ὁσμῇ κατήρες = 'furnished with a bouquet' is odd and but little kept in countenance by ἔρπυλλος . . . φύλλοις κατήρης (*Nic. Ther.* 69) cited by Denniston, yet ἄνθει κατήρες = 'hung with flowers' (referring to the θησαύρισμα) will scarcely do. We have already had the στεφάνους, and to jump over the τυρεύματα and, so to speak, pick them up again is odd; besides which the present which the Old Man makes is not a flagon but the wine that is in the flagon, as may be seen from what else he says about it: it is μικρόν—which I take to mean not 'a small flagon' but *un petit vin*, and it is good to drink when mixed with a weaker wine. That Jackson cites Clement of Alexandria to show that garlands (στεφάνους) were hung round wine vessels is, while typical of his erudition, not to the point.

P. 91 (*Cyc.* 343): this note could have been shortened and simplified by saying plainly that the line presents us with an illegally divided anapaest in the fourth foot.

P. 131 (*Hel.* 1285-7): Jackson objects to Scaliger's τρύχου σεαυτὴν for the ungrammatical τρύχουσα σεαυτὴν on the ground that 'it is temerity to obtrude the none too reputable τρυχώ on Euripides'. But might not τρύχου be taken as a middle imperative of τρύχω? True, no instances of the middle are cited, but the verb is a rare one, and with the reflexive a middle form might be justified.<sup>1</sup> Jackson's own τρύχου· σὺ σεαυτῆς, Μενέλεως κτλ. may be right, but (a) the omission of εἰ is strange, (b) the idiom ('be one's own master') is found only with the verb γίγνεσθαι, at least in classical Greek, and (c) to say that 'the idiom is established for Euripides' and cite in support of this statement nothing better than ἐγὼ δ' ἐμός εἰμι (fr. 1005 (N.<sup>2</sup>)) is at best special pleading. Still less likely is Jackson's γόοις for πάοις in 1287. 'The dead could not live by lamentations' is not the same thing as the commonplace 'one cannot recall the dead to life by lamentations'. This latter it would indeed be 'idle to parallel', though, idly or not, Jackson does cite *S. El.* 139 οὗτοι τὸν . . . πατέρ' ἀνστάσεις . . . γόοις, and *S. fr.* 557(P.) τὸν θανόντα δακρύοις ἀνιστάναι; but neither of these justifies κοῦκ ἂν δύναιτο ζῆν ὁ καθανὼν γόοις.

P. 134 (*Cyc.* 60-62): Jackson gives εἰς αὐλάν—ἐτ' ἀμφινέμη | ποιηρὸς λείπονσα

<sup>1</sup> Kühner-Gerth (ii. i, p. 111) say that the use of the middle with the reflexive is 'häufig', but it must be admitted that nearly all

the reflexives cited are datives. The accusative seems rare.



νομούς;— | Αἰτναίων εἶσω σκοπέλων. His ἀμφιέμῃ for the nonsensical and unmetrical ἀμφιβαίνεις is attractive; but to take λείπουσα as meaning 'disdaining' and to regard, as apparently he does, the π. νομούς as the grass outside the Cyclops' cave is surely impossible. However the passage be emended λείπουσα (so I: LP λιπούσα) νομούς must mean 'leaving your present pasturage'. The manuscripts' ποτ' which Jackson replaces by ἔτ' looks idiomatic (cf. *Phil.* 816 μέθες ποτέ), and should probably not be disturbed. Nor indeed does there seem much harm in λιπούσα. These polyschematist dimeters can take the form of a fourth epitrite followed by a choriamb, as witness ll. 46 and 60, and correspondence need not perhaps be exact.

P. 144 (*I.T.* 818): for the admittedly odd ὦν μ' ἀφείλετο Jackson would read ὦν, ἀφείετο (i.e. ἀφίετο). He cites three or four instances of what he calls 'the once orthodox spelling', i.e. ἀφείετο for ἀφίετο, but, in all modern editions at least, every -ει- has been altered to -ι-. Nor is it easy to see how Jackson justifies his orthography (if that is the right word) by an appeal to *Plat. Crat.* 402 c where Socrates is embarrassed by the form Ποσειδῶν. Socrates is surprised merely because he derived the god's name from Ποσιδεσμος. Jackson, who admits to 'the subtraction of one letter'—he has in fact subtracted two, [μ] and [λ], might as well have been hanged for a sheep and subtracted a third, [ε]. But in any case what does ἀφ[ε]ίετο mean? Jackson translates—or paraphrases—'I remember: it was a good match and it would never have done to let it go'. Besides being a *non-sequitur*—it implies as a previous question not 'Do you remember the λουτρά?' but 'Why did you consent to the marriage?'—this is strongly reminiscent of Lord Burleigh's nod. His correction of κοῦδεις αὐτός in *Tro.* 1203 to κοῦ δις αὐτός is in itself admirable, but it throws no light on the *I.T.* line.

P. 146 (*I.T.* 288): the manuscripts' ἡ δ' ἐκ χιτώνων is plainly impossible, but Jackson's ἡ κ' γειτόνων δέ is surely far too colloquial. Lycurgus and Plato, quoted by him in illustration of this idiom, are not good enough authorities for tragedy. Phrases like ἡ κατηλὶς ἡ κ' γειτόνων (*Ar. Plut.* 435) are well enough; but could Orestes even in his mad fit descend to such a vulgarism as 'the next-door Fury'?

P. 149 (*H.F.* 809 ff.): ἐσορᾶν φαίνει is, as Jackson says, 'unmeaning, unmetrical, and . . . unemended', but his ἐσορώσα φαίνει is inferior to Murray's ἐσορᾶν ἔφανε (which secures correspondence), does not make much sense, and involves an awkward hyperbaton, ἐσορώσα φαίνει . . . ἐς ἄμυλλαν . . . εἰ . . . for ἐσορώσα ἐς ἄμυλλαν φαίνει εἰ . . .

P. 150 (*Ant.* 1095 ff.): certainly Jackson's ἄτῃ μπαλάξαι . . . κάρα gives better sense than the manuscripts' ἄτῃ πατάξαι . . . πάρα; but his remark that the verb πατάσσω is 'invincibly prosaic' is neither true—it is used by both Sophocles and Euripides—nor very honest, when one finds that his ἐμπαλάσσομαι is never found in tragedy.

P. 154 (*Ar. Eccl.* 655–6): ἐκ or ἀπό does indeed seem necessary before τῶν κοινῶν, but Jackson's πόθεν ἐκτίσει ταῦτ'; οὐ γὰρ δὴ κ' τῶν κοινῶν γ' ἐστὶ δίκαιον, with its intolerably vague ταῦτα, seems definitely inferior to Cobet's πόθεν ἐκτίσει ταύτην; οὐ γὰρ δὴ κ' τῶν κοινῶν γε δίκαιον, which has the advantage of keeping the manuscript ταύτην.

P. 155 (*Ajax* 112): χαίρειν . . . τᾶλλ' ἐγὼ σ' ἐφίεμαι is certainly odd Greek for 'I bid thee have thy way in all else'; but Jackson's χαίρειν . . . τᾶλλ' ἔγωγ' ἐφίεμαι = 'the rest may go hang' is very unconvincing. τᾶλλα = τοῖς ἄλλοις

might stand, but *χαίρειν ἐφίεμαι* = *χ. λέγω* or *κελεύω* needs confirmation. Jackson's light-hearted 'anything sufficiently jussive may seemingly be substituted' will be believed by no one who has read Professor Fraenkel's note on *χαίρειν* . . . *καταξιῶ* (*Agam.* 572).

P. 161 (*Ar. Eccl.* 501-3): distrusting, not without reason, *καὶ μίσει σάκον πρὸς τοὶν γνάθων ἔχουσα* = 'and hate having a beard on your chin' = 'and remove your hateful beard', Jackson proposes *μάμισθί* for *καὶ μίσει*. So far as the reviewer can make out, this is supposed to equal *ἐπείγου* . . . *μη(κέτι) σάκον πρὸς τοὶν γνάθων ἔχουσα ἀμισθί*, i.e. 'hasten, no longer wearing a beard at no cost' = *ἐπείγου καὶ μηκέτι σάκον ἔχε, ἀμισθί ἔχουσα αὐτόν*.

It is difficult to know what first to criticize in this, though perhaps the three most obvious awkwardnesses are (1) *ἀμισθί*, which Jackson explains as 'no longer worth the three obols payable to bearer at the Pnyx', (2) the omission of the *ἐτι*, (3) the separation of *μή*—justifiable in itself because of the imperative *ἐπείγου*—from *ἔχουσα*. But worse, if possible, is to follow. In the next line Jackson gives *τὸ τὸτ'* for *τοῦτ'*. This, again as far as the reviewer can make out, is supposed to mean 'for they too (the semi-chorus returning with Praxagora) are coming, having long worn the get-up they had before'—Meineke's *πρὶν* is a deal better than Jackson's *τότε*—, i.e. the other semichorus has already divested itself of its beards. If *αὐται* is taken as referring to this second semichorus and *ἡκουνσιν* is kept, this is perhaps all that can be done; but (1) there is nothing in the play to suggest that the chorus is still split in two, and that one half returns early while the other waits for and accompanies Praxagora on her return. It is clear that the whole chorus enters at l. 478 to form the *ἐπιπάρodos*, and that in fact Praxagora returns unaccompanied. From this it follows that *αὐται* (*nisi leg. αὐταί* (van Leewen)) refers not to any women but to the *γνάθοι*; whence Palmer conjectured *ἀλγοῦσιν* for *ἡκουνσιν*; and though this word is palaeographically unlikely, at least the sense is clear. Defending his *σχῆμα τὸ τὸτ'* | *ἔχουσα* Jackson remarks 'the one Aristophanic example of a tribrach in the sixth foot of an iambic tetrameter'—he refers to *Plut.* 274—'would have to receive a companion'. How many such sixth-foot tribrachs there are in Aristophanes I do not know, but a casual inspection reveals three (*Eg.* 893; *Nub.* 1056 and 1440). And supposing there were only one, is this an argument for or against Jackson's emendation?

P. 184 (*O.C.* 842): Jackson rightly points out that the passive *ἐναίρεται* is odd with an inanimate subject, and that Jebb is not justified in translating the word as though it were *ὑπρίζεται*; but would the chorus in calling for help against those who would abduct Antigone exclaim *πόλις ἐγείρεται, πόλις ἐμὰ σθένει*, 'Athens is rising, Athens is strong!'?

P. 204 (*Rhes.* 835): in reading *διζοίμεθα* for *δεζαίμεθα* Jackson admits that he is 'seduced' by a 'Wardour Street' word. He might have further confessed that the verb is not tragic and indeed is not found until the third century. Or does he date the play so late?

It will be seen from the above that Jackson's less happy emendations nearly all spring from a blind, or at least shortsighted, faith in the *ductus litterarum*, sometimes at the expense of the meaning of the passage 'emended'.

Misprints in this book are almost non-existent, and the few that there are are all harmless except for one on p. 206 (l. 2), where, after the final proofs had been passed, as it seems, *σῶζει* [*sic*] has become *σῶζε*.

## SPECIMENS OF GREEK DRAMATIC POETS

F. L. LUCAS: *Greek Drama for Everyman*. Pp. xxv+454. London: Dent, 1954. Cloth, 21s. net.

THIS volume is a companion to Mr. Lucas's *Greek Poetry for Everyman*. It 'contains translations of Aeschylus' *Prometheus* and *Agamemnon*, Sophocles' *Antigone* and *Oedipus the King*, Euripides' *Hippolytus* and *The Bacchae*, and Aristophanes' *Clouds*; secondly, summaries, with extracts, of the other thirty-seven plays; thirdly, what seemed the best fragments of lost plays, both by these dramatists and by others. The introductions and notes, necessarily brief, are of course meant not for the Greek scholar, but for the ordinary English reader who cares for poetry and wishes to travel through a great age long gone.' A little later the author remarks that the translations also are not made for scholars: 'scholars do not need them; and it is only human that they should tend to dislike them'. It is in keeping with his purpose that Lucas's volume is introduced by a quotation from Professor Garrod and dedicated to Sir Herbert Grierson. There is also a preface on the art of translation, and a chronological table.

Whether they like Lucas's translations and notes or not, scholars may feel grateful to him for providing the non-classical student with a guide which is both scholarly and up to date and is exceptionally readable. For his principles of translating tragedy, Lucas goes to Headlam: blank verse, not too free, for iambics, and rhyming stanzas preserving the general pattern and the strophic correspondence, but not clinging closely to the rhythm, for lyrics. The general rules he lays down for himself are, in order of importance, to give the same sort of pleasure as the original, to be true to the spirit of his author and of his author's period ('our predecessors romanticized, we vulgarize'), and to be faithful in detail.

It is a mark of Lucas's fluency as a writer that he is almost wholly successful in living up to his principles. His translations have no striking originality of style, but they are accurate, graceful, and dignified, and they have the merit of not veiling the Greek, so that for long stretches the poetic quality of the original shines through.

The introductions and notes, which form about a quarter of the book, are illuminated and enlivened by an enviable width of reading. Being an eminent critic, Lucas can afford to scatter the phrase 'I feel' abundantly about his pages, which at least conveys the personal nature of his judgements. This cultivated subjectivism, though open, becomes unfortunate when he is out of sympathy with his author, as he is in dealing with certain plays of Aeschylus and Euripides and with most of Sophocles. Occasionally he redeems whole pages of unsympathetic criticism with a sentence which seems to betray an awareness that the truth is elsewhere. It is almost as an afterthought that he finely illustrates the character of Heracles in the *Trachiniae* by a quotation from George Sand, and greatly weakens what he has said in criticism of the *Oedipus Tyrannus* by a footnote alluding to its effect on a small circle of friends to whom it was translated impromptu from beginning to end by Jean Racine: 'J'ai vu nos meilleurs acteurs sur le théâtre, j'ai entendu nos meilleures pièces: mais jamais rien n'approcha du trouble où me jeta ce récit: et au moment même que je vous écris, je m'imagine voir encore Racine avec son livre à la main, et nous tous consternés autour de lui.' This is a more interesting fact about the *Oedipus*

*Tyrannus* than all Lucas's strictures on its 'not very attractive' characters, its 'repulsive' theme, and its 'incredible' plot. His suggestion that its greatness lies in its being simply a 'masterpiece of pure "theatre"' is as unconvincing as his condemnation of the *Septem* because it has no character to arouse his sympathy, and of the *Heracles* as 'a rather frigid play' in which 'two passages stand out'. Lucas speaks highly of the *Antigone*, but when it loses the one character who appeals to him, it 'weakens towards its close; it flags without Antigone; as *Ajax* without its hero, or *Hippolytus* without Phaedra'. Such criticism seems to give too large a place in tragedy to the invention of likeable characters, and to impute to the—no doubt, fallible—poets a curious ignorance of their business.

Fortunately, for six tragedies and one comedy, as well as for a long scene of Menander's *Epitrepontes*, Lucas gives his readers a real possibility of thinking about Greek drama for themselves, for it is one of his virtues that adverse criticism of a play makes no difference to the eloquence of his translation; nor is his criticism, however unorthodox, ever dull. *Greek Drama for Everyman* will furnish students of English with the best compendious introduction to the forerunners of Marlowe and Shakespeare.

University of Edinburgh

A. H. COXON

## THE BUDÉ DEMOSTHENES

OCTAVE NAVARRE, PIERRE ORSINI: Démosthène, *Plaidoyers Politiques*. Tome i (C. Andr., C. Lept., C. Timocr.). Texte établi et traduit. (Collection Budé.) Pp. lxxviii+222 (double). Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1954. Paper, 900 fr.

NAVARRE died before the war. Raymond Weil helped Orsini with the revision. Both editors were responsible for the text and translation. Navarre wrote Introduction part ii on the technique and talent of D.; Orsini produced part i on D.'s entry into politics, and part iii on the text, in establishing which they claim to have adopted the principles of reasonable eclecticism and conservatism. The importance of these speeches as throwing light on D.'s political and literary development—as well as his lack of scruples—is brought out effectively.

Some inconvenience results from a portion of the notes on the translation being printed at the foot of the pages, while others—*notes complémentaires*—are in an appendix, and from the references in the apparatus being to the lines (not numbered in the text) of each section; this is particularly awkward when a section is not completed on one page.

*Translation.* The following examples may be given of inadequately rendered words: definite article xx Hyp. ii. 11, xxii. 8 (*et passim*); demonstrative pronoun xxii. 40 (*et passim*); reflexive xxii. 41; emphatic αὐτός xxiv. 31; καί xx. 13; οὐδέ xx. 86, 145, xxiv. 72; ζημίαν xx. 9; ἀναμίμηται ibid. 28, 50; παρόδου (following Weil) 53; προορωμένους 162; ἀδικήσονται 164; ὥς xxiv Hyp. ii. 5; ἐντελέστατα, ἀναφέροιο ibid. 11; πολλάκις xxiv. 135; ὡς πλείστους ibid. 218; tenses xx. 74, 91, xxiv. 146.

More serious errors are xx Hyp. ii. 2 δικάζωσι 'traduits en justice', where the *note complémentaire* betrays well-founded uneasiness; xx. 10 κτᾶται 'elle implique', with the law instead of the city as subject; xxii. 6 the connexion of δέ is missed; ibid. 8 Weil's <μηδέ> is translated but not printed in the text; 22 τεκμήρια 'déductions' (better in 76 'preuve'); 63 λαβὼν ἐξουσίαν 'donnant libre cours';

68 καταφαίην 'répondre'; 77 εὖ φρονῶν 'être sensé' (it is in fact contrasted with ἐχθροί); xxiv. 42 ἐπιγράψαι taken as προσγράψαι; *ibid.* 55 προσάγειν made to govern 'l'affaire' instead of 'les cautions'; 129 ἤγε 'valait' (so Kennedy, but it means 'weighed'). Moods appear to be confused xxiv. 147 and note comp. (p. 211) on xx. 139.

Infelicitous are xx. 81 ἦλθεν 'marché'—with feet for oars (?); xxii. 38 βουλευτήριον 'assemblée'; xxiv. 146 τῷ ξύλῳ 'les fers'. In xx. 11 'à quel point . . . tout à fait' introduces an illogicality of which D. is not guilty. But it may be noted that τρόπον in xx. 77 is taken rightly, where Kennedy and Vince are wrong.

*Text.* The editors are apt to write 'nos' in the apparatus when the reading has already been suggested by predecessors; cf. δωρεάν xx. 2; <τῇν> xxii. 6; ψήφισμ' αὐτ' xxiv. 27; 'fortasse ἦ τις?' *ibid.* 197 ('?' being redundant with 'fortasse'), a poor thing but Wayte's.

Of original suggestions xx Hyp. ii. 4 <δεῖν> is not happy with διὰ; ἄλλοις xx. 23 would be more likely if the manuscripts had τοῖς as well; διαπραξόμενος xxii. 42 is the wrong tense, and they do not translate it as a future; θεοσεχθρίαν *ibid.* 59 is hardly supported by the cetics of Arist. *Vesp.* 418, where the scholiast's quotation from Archippus is not conclusive; ὁ [*sic*] ἀγών xxiv. 5 is unsuitable from the point of view of the jurors; τὰ μὲν καὶ δεκαπλᾷ *ibid.* 83 gives an anticlimax. More plausible are σύγκρισιν xx Hyp. ii. 8; πάντων xxii. 51 (cf. Thuc. iv. 86. 4); οὐδέ xxiv. 26; τὸν δεσμὸν *ibid.* 36; ἀπολογισάμενος δεῖξαι (though a considerable change) *ibid.* 108; <πάντ> (Orsini, curing hiatus) 187.

Occasionally a reading of S is rejected without good reason, e.g. ἐπρέσβειεν and ὁρᾶτε δέ xxiv. 138. οὐδέν xxiv. 157 is adopted though it seems inferior to οὐδέν, and is read by S<sub>1</sub> only. There are some inaccuracies; xx. 28 '1-3 . . . om. A // 2 διέρρηκεν SL<sub>1</sub>AF'; xxii. 5 'αὐτῷ S', where Butcher says 'αὐτῷ S me teste', cf. xxiv. 124. xxiv. 49 'Περὶ τούτων νῦν Weil' should be 'περὶ τούτων, νῦν ἀναγίνωσκε', and here, as often, a 'peut être' or 'fortasse' is not distinguished from a reading printed in an editor's text, cf. xxiv. 1, 187. xxiv. 158 'ἐνεκα . . . Blass' should be 'εἵνεκα'.

The editors draw attention to the instances of hiatus in the presumed first draft passages of xxiv, but they seem insensitive to hiatus elsewhere, perhaps following S where most editors adopt some simple correction; cf. αὐτὸ ἀκριβῶς xx. 18; κακὰ εἰργασμένους xxii. 41; γε ἐφ' *ibid.* 45; πώποτε ἐν xxiv. 16. Or they may adopt a reading involving several short syllables, when there is good authority for avoiding them, as ὅσα προσήκει xxii. 57; ἐστὶν ἐνοχος *ibid.* 69; ἦν περ ἐπὶ 71; ὑποσχέσει κατέχων xxiv. 161. Or they may make suggestions involving hiatus; cf. xx. 35, xxii. 33.

*Notes.* There are some inadequacies in the notes on history and antiquities. P. 15, n. 2, a fine might bring about exile. P. 55, n. 5, add ref. to C.R. xii. 233. P. 111, n. 1, Διονυσοκόλακες in Aristotle refers to Διονύσου τεχνίται; the reference to flatterers of Dionysius is Athenaeus vi. 249-50. P. 204, n. on xx. 1, 14, qualify the remark about the professional paid συνήγορος with a reference to Jebb, A.O. i, p. cxxviii; Lipsius, A.R. p. 908; Dinarchus, in *Dem.* 111. P. 206, n. on 59, 2, date 410-408 (Weil) deserves mention. P. 208, n. on 91, 8, for '411' read '413'. P. 209, n. on 99, 5, mention ἀνάκρισις. P. 212, n. on 159, 7, Aeschines iii. 109 and 120 refer to first Sacred War. P. 220, n. on xxiv. 127, 4, the reference might be to the Athenian League; *ibid.* 5, the reference is to bribery, not embezzlement.

Probably misinterpreted—P. 33, n. 1, Telestes could hardly be 'un nom

commun' without the article. P. 108, n. 1, 'solliciter un récompense' should be 'exercer des droits civiques'. P. 173, n. 3, Androtion, Glaucetes, and Melanopus were a trio of ambassadors; it does not seem a 'supposition bizarre' to conceive of Timocrates—the sole defendant—acting on his own. P. 202, n. on xxii. 34, 10, παραγράφεισθαι taken differently from the usual view, given in n. on xx. 99, 6 (p. 209). P. 203, n. on 56, 10, what evidence is there for εἰσφοραὶ used in a 'general sense'? Plato *Laus* is hardly good enough. P. 211, n. on xx. 142, 6, the passage is in fact exactly in accord with 137.

On p. lxi, n. 1, the Oxford text is inaccurately described as 's.d.'

*Attributions.* The speeches against Nausimachus and Callippus are not by D. (p. xxxviii, n. 1 and p. 200, n. on xxii. 4, 7). P. 215, n. on xxiv. 27, 8, for 'Eschine' read 'Démosthène'. P. 218, n. on xxiv. 27, 8, for 'Antiphon' read 'Andoc.'

*References.* P. 35, n. 2, for 'p. 3' read 'p. 1'. P. 111, n. 1, for 'xi 433' read 'vi 249-50'. P. 213, n. on xxiv. 9, 10, for '9' read '13'.

*Misprints.* I noticed between thirty and forty minor typographical faults in French, Latin, and Greek; the last mostly involved breathings or accents. More serious is the omission of λέγεται after φανακίσαι in xx. 88.

But in spite of some defects the translation seems lively, the apparatus is useful, and the notes give information from inscriptions and recent historical and critical work.

Worcester College, Oxford

A. N. BRYAN-BROWN

## GREEK THEOLOGY

H. J. ROSE, P. CHANTRAINE, O. GIGON, B. SNELL, H. D. F. KITTO, W. J. VERDENIUS, F. CHAPOUTHIER: *La Notion du Divin depuis Homère jusqu'à Platon*. Sept exposés et discussions. (Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique, Tome i.) Pp. 308. Vandœuvres, Geneva: Fondation Hardt (Cambridge: Heffer), 1954. Cloth, £2.

THIS series of lectures is opened by H. J. Rose with a useful survey of religious antiquities and of the theological problems, such as the prosperity of the wicked, which troubled the Greeks, at least from Theognis onwards. He begins 'as far back as we can go'; but very soon we come to Homer, whose 'barons', we are told, were 'singularly enlightened', apparently for the negative reason that they had no great awe in the presence of divine beings. They did, however, foreshadow the doctrine of a 'transcendental Deity' by their recognition of a gulf between man and the gods with their great power and knowledge and freedom from death. Similarly the lower orders, for whom Hesiod acts as spokesman, promoted in some degree the belief in the omnipresence of Deity by their cult of 'numerous local objects of worship', a tendency which led, paradoxically enough, to the comparative neglect of Zeus (no doubt, by the higher orders as well) even in the Athens of Aeschylus. In general, it is held that, despite some traces of *mana*, the typical Greek belief was in a personal god or gods, not in an impersonal force. This sound observation seems to have made insufficient impact upon one or two of the subsequent lectures. It is worth noting that Rose finds little or no trace in Homer of the view that the gods are subject to a higher law which keeps their conflicts within bounds. He perhaps overstates the absence of 'an all-powerful orthodoxy' among the Greeks, and his treatment of the trials for impiety seems too cursory; in particular, the



indictment of Socrates receives an interpretation ('interference with the established State cults', etc.) which appears to me to run rather wide of the evidence.

The Homeric picture is described in more detail by P. Chantraine, who argues that Homer's anthropomorphism is 'a profoundly rationalistic conception'. Homer describes inanimate objects (like the river Scamander) in human terms; he 'mythologizes' abstractions (like *Hypnos* or *Phobos*); and this method is, according to Chantraine, akin to explaining things by their physical causes. The lecturer did not seem to favour the suggestion that literary motives might account for much of the 'humanity' of such entities. It is of interest that Homer is no longer thought incapable of abstract thought. The theme of personification and that of the supremacy of Zeus, who, it is stressed, has some concern for justice between man and man even in Homer, lead directly to the examination of Hesiod's theology in the third lecture. Here B. Snell neatly illustrates Hesiod's method of abstraction and systematization from the names of the nine Muses, which provide 'a poetics in theological form'. In both these lectures there is a tendency to overestimate the sweetness and light which are thought to mark the deities of Homer by contrast with those of Hesiod, though admittedly Homer's gods are frequently irrational, unpredictable, and dangerous to approach. At any rate it is made clear that Hesiod allows more for the dismal side of life and myth; and despite his insistence on the supremacy of Zeus and his justice, he is accordingly regarded as 'the founder of dualism in Greek thought'—a title which seems to me very much open to question.

The theology of the pre-Socratics is very thoroughly discussed by O. Gigon, who defends his own position against that of Jaeger, particularly on Xenophanes. He considers the development of Ionian philosophy up to, and including, Democritus, as largely an attempt to overcome men's fear of earthquakes, lightning, and other natural phenomena. The process involved much purification of the idea of the divine from primitive crudities or (for primitivism was one of the questions at issue) its restoration to primitive purity. Gigon shows how different inferences were drawn from the fact that man worships gods whereas the beasts do not; if the beasts are right, atheism results; if they are not, the discussion proceeds legitimately to such matters as the interest of the gods in human affairs and such theories as the full-blown teleology found in Xenophon's *Memorabilia*.

<sup>1</sup> The main contention of H. F. D. Kitto seems to be that the gods in Aeschylus and Sophocles 'represent' the background of rationality and moral law without which (though it must be owned that the point did not occur to Aristotle) the dramatic action would lack the kind of universality described in the *Poetics*. This is thought to account for the double causation, divine and human, of particular acts: is it, for example, Apollo's grudge or Clytaemnestra's jealousy which causes the death of Cassandra? The answer seems to be: both, acting quite independently of each other. If it be objected that Apollo's proceedings create more problems than they solve, it would, I imagine, be pointed out that Apollo becomes a reformed character in the later plays of the trilogy. Everyone, Zeus, Agamemnon, and the rest, becomes 'improved'; and this improvement 'reflects' the progress of city-state civilization. Apparently then, in Kitto's view, the moral order which outgrows its imperfections has no existence independent of human history; the gods are impersonal 'forces' wholly contained within the world, 'never external to our universe'. It seems to me that Zeus was for Aeschylus rather more important than that. Sophocles is similarly



interpreted, except that for him no development needs to be assumed in the rationality of the universe. Oracles are regarded as part of that rationality (though few of them seem to support this view)—did not Sophocles tell us in the *O.T.* that without oracles life would be a random, irrational affair? 'The fact that all could be predicted *shows* that all obeyed rational law' (my italics). I should need stronger evidence before accrediting Sophocles with an argument of such doubtful validity.

For F. Chapouthier, who regrettably died before the publication of this book, the most striking quality of Euripides is his receptiveness. Euripides welcomed ideas and information from all quarters, but did not trouble to systematize what he took from others. As he was not a coherent thinker about gods or anything else his theological views never change, never progress. Nevertheless he did a service by insisting on the essential connexion of such qualities as justice and purity with the idea of the divine. This lecture seems to me the best piece of exposition in the book. The report of the subsequent discussion shows that the belief in Euripides as primarily an 'intellectual' dies hard.

In the final lecture W. J. Verdenius gives his interpretation of Plato's concept of God. He regards the idea of Good as the supreme god, but as he regards this god as an inactive, impersonal, absolute principle of order, the equation seems merely to reduce deity to ideality. The other ideas are 'transpositions' of the idea of Good on to the plane of multiplicity; and they also are 'gods', for Verdenius identifies the 'everlasting gods' of *Tim.* 37 c with the ideas which the Demiurge copies. In what sense the Demiurge is thought to carry out this task is not clear, for he too is 'fundamentally an abstraction', the productive 'aspect' of the idea of Good, though not an emanation. This 'aspect', the Demiurge, migrates from *Tim.* to *Laus* x to produce another 'aspect', the 'best soul'. There are many 'strata', increasing in concreteness in proportion to their distance from the highest principle. The star-gods belong to one of these; and still lower are the Olympian gods, who are 'reflections' or 'representations' of 'the abstract ideas'. If this system really were Plato's, it would still fail to explain his non-mythical references to gods, since gods would be superfluous to its workings. This follows equally from Verdenius's quite indiscriminating treatment of inspiration, according to which human effort and divine aid are merely two ways of saying the same thing.

It has not been possible in this review to make many references to the discussions which follow the several lectures; they are as full of interest as the prepared discourses.

University of Sheffield

J. TATE

## ARISTOTLE'S DOCTRINE OF REASON

EDMOND BARBOTIN: *La Théorie aristotélicienne de l'intellect d'après Théophraste*. (Aristote: Traductions et Études.) Pp. 312. Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1954. Paper, 165 B.fr.

THIS latest addition to the distinguished series of Aristotelian studies issued under the auspices of the University of Louvain is a full-scale investigation into the doctrine of the active and passive reason as treated by Theophrastus. The author tells us that he began with the aim of examining the surviving texts not as a contribution to the understanding of Aristotle, but as a sort of special study complementary to the work of Hamelin, *La Théorie de l'intellect d'après Aristote et*

*ses commentateurs* (Paris, 1953). The point of view was thus to be prospective, looking forward to medieval philosophy. This aim was changed in the course of the undertaking when it was realized that despite the brevity of the fragments they could and should be used to shed light on Aristotle's views. It was in fact found that the unanimity of commentators ancient and modern in recognizing the exceptional authority of Theophrastus was only equalled by their agreement in neglecting the information he gives. The result is a most valuable and interesting study which makes a real contribution to the understanding both of Theophrastus and of Aristotle.

Barbotin confirms the view already expressed by R. D. Hicks in the appendix to his edition of the *De Anima*: there is no reason to suppose that Theophrastus has departed from the position held by Aristotle. Rather by answering difficulties suggested by what Aristotle says he gives depth and precision to the doctrine at a number of points. Briefly, the picture which emerges is something like the following. Starting from the desire to retain the primacy of *νοῦς* over *νοητά* in contradistinction to the Platonists, both Aristotle and Theophrastus are led to deny that *νοῦς* can be passive in the sense in which this is true of *αἰσθησις*. It is the *νοητόν* which awakens the spontaneity of *νοῦς* and offers it the opportunity to actualize itself. The active reason is innate in us, but we do not think all the time, because it is mixed with the passive or better potential reason and it is the nature of the latter to be intermittent and imperfect. Potential reason, while innate and *συμφυής* with us, comes from without. This is to be explained as meaning that it is included in the embryo from the beginning and is awakened therein by the active reason. The active reason is immanent rather than transcendent, and the evidence of Theophrastus is on the side of Themistius and St. Thomas Aquinas in the famous controversy rather than on the side of Averroës. Yet for Theophrastus *νοῦς* itself does belong to the realm of transcendent entities. The lower parts of the soul are related to the higher parts of the soul by participation, and the same relationship obtains between the soul and God. The divine *νοῦς* communicates itself with all human beings from the moment of their origin, and in consequence they participate in the same divine *νοῦς*. It was not in fact without good reason that the doctrine of Aristotle proved so attractive to Christian thinkers.

The author is the first to admit the tentative nature of much of the reconstruction of the arguments of Theophrastus and he has held the scales fairly between the need to extract all that can be got from the fragments of Theophrastus and the danger of reading the desired answers into the fragments. Two appendixes give a critical text of the fragments and discuss detailed points of interpretation. The whole book will be indispensable in any future discussions of the evidence of Theophrastus.

University of Manchester

G. B. KERFERD

### PLUTARCH *DE MUSICA*

FRANÇOIS LASSERE: *Plutarque, De la Musique*. Texte, traduction, commentaire, précédés d'une étude sur l'éducation musicale dans la Grèce antique. (Bibliotheca Helvetica Romana, i.) Pp. 185. Lausanne: Urs Graf-Verlag, 1954. Paper, 25 Sw. Fr.

OVER fifty years have elapsed since the French scholars Weil and Reinach produced their edition of Plutarch *De Musica*. Its deficiencies have long

been recognized, chiefly the multiplicity of rash emendations and arbitrary transpositions which makes even the identification of passages for reference difficult; moreover, it is now very difficult to obtain, and with good reason scholars have lamented the absence of a good edition of this important work. Now, hard on the heels of the new Teubner text of Ziegler, comes an edition by François Lasserre, author of *Les Épodes d'Archiloque*, with a lengthy introductory essay, a translation, and notes.

Lasserre's text is markedly conservative, and it is interesting in this respect to compare it with Ziegler's. Though both refrain from the wholesale transpositions of their predecessors, in the latter a number of the emendations made by Westphal and Weil-Reinach have been printed and many others recorded in the apparatus. Most of these are neither accepted nor even mentioned by Lasserre. It is fair to say that this caution, while admirable in the larger questions of transposition or emendation of 'technical' passages (often to suit a preconceived theory), has in smaller details resulted in the retention of some improbable readings, even if the solution is not everywhere certain. For example, at 1132 a some noun is surely omitted after *Λητοῦς τε*, as it is unlikely that Leto's unremarkable birth was a subject for song like that of her celebrated children; 1135 c W.-R.'s *καίνοι* for *ἱκαίνοι* is most probable, and I am doubtful if Lasserre's translation 'qui se distinguèrent' can be derived from his text; 1136 f *ἄλλα* has no point (as his translation recognizes); in the Pherecrates fragment, while one will readily admit that Wytttenbach's *ἀπέδυσσε* does not supply the required double meaning, Elmsley's *καμπῶν* (from both *κάμπη* and *καμπή*) in the last line gains additional point and should be accepted; 1142 e *αὐτῇ* must surely be changed to *ταύτῃ* (again Lasserre's translation appears to point to such a change).

Among places where Lasserre's conservatism is praiseworthy, however, I may record 1131 d, where *γραμμαῖς* is shown to be defensible, or 1142 f, where Bergk's daring emendation *ἐν Μυσοῖς*, which rests on flimsy support, is ignored (although the manuscript reading is a little odd and remains suspect). Among other readings printed by Lasserre which have usually been emended, *κατὰ-τύμματα* (1138 b: some manuscripts have *καταττύματα*, others *καττύματα*, which the editors prefer) and *φιλομαθεῖς* (ibid.) may be noted. An interesting new interpretation of a well-known passage (1135 d) is proposed: Lasserre, reading *ἐκδιώξαντες*, an alternative found in one group of manuscripts, retains *θεματικόν*, for which more than one emendation has been made, but in a sense different from that assumed by the editors who print it with the verb *διώξαντες*, viz. 'traditionnelle, classique'.

Lasserre's own textual alterations, as one might expect, are few, and mainly take the form of suggested supplements in lacunae. I am doubtful of his insertion *ποικίλῳ* before *ῥυθμῷ* in the corrupt passage at 1137 d, as it is virtually contradicted in the following chapter—the 'ancient poets' (including presumably Phrynichus and Aeschylus) in fact admired rhythmical *ποικιλία*—to say nothing of Euripides. At 1132 d the corruption in the names of the *νόμοι* and its source are persuasively cleared up (cf. p. 106).

Concerning the attribution of the dialogue, Lasserre, following the accepted view, does not consider the claims of Plutarch as its author, and the reader is referred for the earlier controversy to the introduction of W.-R., who were disposed to accept its authenticity, while admitting that it was in parts compiled from older sources, as a work *de sa première jeunesse*. In a brief section

(pp. 99-104) he argues that the principal source of the dialogue's ill-arranged material was the vast musical encyclopaedia of Dionysius 'the Musician' before its abridgement by Rufus. This view is further documented throughout the commentary.

At the outset of this, Lasserre is careful to stress that it does not seek to replace the commentaries of Volkmann and Weil-Reinach. This decision explains the brevity of the notes, although the reader may regret the necessity of consulting less accessible editions with fuller commentaries for information which Lasserre has not considered relevant to his object, that of making these notes for the most part complementary to, and explanatory of, his introductory essay on the history of musical education in Greece.

I have left discussion of this essay to the last as it is undoubtedly the finest part of the book and will repay much careful study. Outstanding are the sections devoted to two of the most important figures of Greek music, Lasos and Damon, about whom, however, the total bulk of specific information which has come down to us is scanty, with the result that their contributions to the technical and 'ethical' development of music respectively have rarely been so well acknowledged as here. The sixth of the eight chapters is exclusively devoted to Damon, and in it Lasserre reconstructs the various themes which must have composed his controversial discourse on music addressed to the Areopagites, showing how much information, over and above the meagre testimonia and fragments in Diels, can be reasonably derived from Plato and other writers who were influenced by him, while reminiscences of his doctrine, and occasionally of his vocabulary, colour musical writings for centuries. These 'fragments of the Areopagiticus' are assembled as an appendix to this chapter. Other matter pertaining to his life and political affinities is also touched upon, for example the pro-Spartan inclinations which probably contributed to his ostracism. The suggestion that the eulogy of Spartan manners by Archidamus in Thucydides i and the Hippocleides story in Herodotus may include reminiscences of Damon's address is interesting.

The earlier chapters deal with the place occupied by music in society from Homer onwards, the emergence of it as a self-sufficient art or discipline through its continual development in the hands of the lyric poets (details of which abound in the *De Musica*), and finally, through its association in Athens with the education particularly of youths of the upper classes, the keen debate which arose regarding its importance in character-training. The rivalries of musical styles of which we have traces in Lasos, Pratinas, and Pindar, the application of the theory of 'imitation' to music, the ethical judgments based on stylistic associations, the manipulation of musical legends (Apollo-Marsyas-Athena), and the origins of *aulos* music are carefully studied.

In the last chapters Lasserre continues the tale of Damon's influence and the opposition to his theories from Cynic, Sceptic, and Epicurean schools, whose type of criticism had already led to qualifications in Plato's *Laws* and to changes in the fundamentally Damonian doctrine of Aristotle and his successors, in order to answer valid objections at its weaker points, and to fit the changing musical scene in which professionalism had replaced the amateur aristocratic ideals which coloured earlier theory.

This is all excellent reading. One wishes that the compiler of the *De Musica* had digested and presented his far more abundant material with equal clarity.

University of Edinburgh

E. K. BORTHWICK

## GREEK PARTICLES

J. D. DENNISTON: *The Greek Particles*. Second Edition. Pp. lxxxii+658. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954. Cloth, 50s. net.

THIS 'really great work of scholarship' (see *C. R.* xlviii. 221 ff.) must be kept available, and every effort to that end is to be welcomed. In the present issue the pagination of the first edition up to p. 580 has had to be approximately preserved for technical reasons. Within these limits the text now incorporates not only the former addenda and corrigenda but also many modifications and additions noted by Denniston during his last fifteen years of life. Some corrections and additions have been contributed also by Mr. K. J. Dover, who prepared this second edition for the press. The task has been ingeniously done, at the cost of certain excisions, abbreviations, and the relegation of a few portions of the old text to the new addenda. In the process half of the third section of the Bibliography (p. 600 of the first edition) has accidentally disappeared.

A sample correction is the substitution of 'hardly ever' for 'never' in the former statement that connective οὐδέ without preceding negation never occurs in Attic prose (pp. lxxi, 190). Under this negative one still misses any mention of the puzzling οὐδέ πολλοῦ δεῖ ('No; far from it': Demosthenes xix. 30, etc.). In view of Denniston's article in *C. R.* xlix. 12 it is surprising to find the non-occurrence of δοῦν in manuscripts still asserted (pp. 449, 460). And apparently he still believed, on grounds now slightly different but no stronger than before, in post-Homeric μέν in the subordinate clause with δέ in the main clause (p. 379). On δέ 'for ἦ', μάλλον δέ seems as deserving of mention as εἰ δέ βούλει. The reference is δέ I C (1) (iii); and there are even more formidable subdivisions than this (p. 171). Perhaps page-headings or marginal notes might make it easier to find them, if a more extensive rewriting ever becomes possible; one is grateful for the new cross-references, but they do not always give the page number. P. 169: even if 'we might', we certainly ought not to 'expect to find' γάρ instead of δέ after a pronominal article (Thucydides i. 86. 2). P. 291: καί I (5), formerly (4): this paragraph (where a closing bracket still needs to be inserted after the first reference to Herodotus), dealing with καί as linking 'appositionally related ideas', hardly does justice to the exegetical καί which links two expressions of one and the same idea. There are passages, none of which seems to be cited, where καί means 'i.e.' or the like: for example, in Aristotle's *Poetics* alone the following are clear instances: 1450<sup>a</sup>22, 32, 1451<sup>a</sup>38, 1459<sup>a</sup>19—sometimes τε precedes (see Bywater on *Poetics* 1453<sup>a</sup>32). I mention this point because there is a tendency, natural enough in view of the astonishing amount which Denniston managed to include, to suppose that if a usage is not represented in this book it does not exist. For a similar reason I regret that the introduction (xliii ff.) makes no mention of the 'ampliative' variety of asyndeton, which is at least a highly tenable explanation of certain passages of Plato (see Adam on *Rep.* 497<sup>b</sup>11). P. lxi: the last sentence of the note should scarcely have been retained—perhaps a reference to *C. Q.* xxx. 73 would be in point?

Two indexes have been added. The first lists combinations of particles; I regret that it ignores the Introduction, which sometimes offers more explanation than Denniston was willing to give in the text. This index is certainly a great help, since formerly it was by no means always obvious which member

of a combination one should try first in seeking to track down the combination. But it would be a still greater advantage to have a complete list of particles and other words and phrases discussed; one may wish, for example, to compare the various remarks about *ὥσπερ* (pp. 421, 490) to see if Denniston really intended the hard saying that *ὥσπερ* 'is in Attic a merely stylistic substitute for the simple *ὥς*'.

The second index, occupying 58 pages, is of authors and passages cited in the Introduction and in the (revised) text. The work of Mrs. Denniston, it has been extremely well done; and one can but repeat the tribute of Mr. Dover that 'all classical scholars will be greatly in her debt'. Compiled apparently from a corrected copy of the first edition, it has had its accuracy disturbed—though very rarely—by the subsequent slight rearrangement of a few pages: thus Thuc. vii. 68. 2 appears now on p. 291, not (as stated and as in the first edition) on p. 292.

University of Sheffield

J. TATE

## THE GREEK VERB

MARTÍN SÁNCHEZ RUIPÉREZ: *Estructura del sistema de aspectos y tiempos del verbo griego antiguo*. Análisis funcional sincrónico. (Theses et Studia Philologica Salmaticensia, vii.) Pp. xii+180. Salamanca: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1954. Paper.

RUIPÉREZ's book has, as he claims, a twofold interest. To those concerned with general descriptive linguistics it offers a particular application of a theory of morphological oppositions based on that of R. Jakobson, to the Hellenist and Indoeuropeanist 'a more scientific and comprehensive interpretation of the aspects and tenses of the Greek verb'. Two chapters are devoted to an exposition of theory and method. While not denying the validity and interest of historical linguistics, Ruipérez insists that a language must first be described as a static system of signs. He adopts de Saussure's distinction of *langue* and *parole*, interpreting the former as what belongs to the system, the latter as the realization of the system in speech. The empirical method of classical grammar takes each category in isolation, catalogues its uses and attempts to unify them by various unsystematic procedures, whereas the structural method regards each category as defined by its relation to others. The grammarian's task is to describe the morphology of a language as a system of oppositions, each of two terms differing in respect of one notion. One term, called the marked term, expresses positively this basic notion; the other, the unmarked term, is indifferent to the expression of the basic notion (neutral value), or—and this is an important departure from Jakobson—denotes its absence or expresses the contrary notion (negative value). For example, the basic notion of the opposition *present stem/aorist stem* is that of duration; the present stem (marked term) has durative meaning, the aorist (unmarked term) sometimes is indifferent with regard to duration (complexive and gnomic aorists), sometimes expresses the contrary notion of punctuality. An important corollary of this doctrine is the principle of neutralization, by which in certain conditions an opposition is wholly or partly abolished; e.g. the present indicative is indifferent with regard to the basic notion of the opposition *present stem/aorist stem*, and a tendency to the same indifference appears in the subjunctive and optative. The purpose of



linguistic description is therefore to identify the elements of the system, to determine the meanings of each and the oppositions between them, with their basic notions and marked terms, and finally to account for every use of each category as a realization in *parole* of the value(s) belonging to it in *langue*, i.e. as an element of the system.

This, in outline, is the theory and method which Ruipérez applies to the Greek verb with admirable consistency, clarity, and subtlety. His treatment is dominated by his distinction between 'transformative' verbs, i.e. those denoting such actions as effect a change of state in the subject or the object, and 'non-transformative' verbs. In the former class the achievement, in the latter the initiation of the action, has the greater prominence. Consequently, the values of categories are realized differently in each class; for example, the negative (punctual) value of the aorist stem is realized as ingressive ('initive') in non-transformative verbs, as expressing accomplishment ('finitive') in transformative verbs. Using the same distinction, Ruipérez shows that the two types of perfect represented by τέθηκα and γέγηθα are realizations, in transformative and non-transformative verbs respectively, of the basic value of the perfect, defined as 'consideración del contenido verbal después de su término'.

Ruipérez considers, among many interesting problems of detail, the suggested aspectual distinctions between alternative present formations, finding none valid save in the type μίμνω/μένω. He rejects Prévot's view of an aspectual difference between aorists in -ην and -θην. In this, while much of his criticism is well founded, his own treatment is disappointing. Having discovered that aorists in -ην, unlike those in -θην, are confined to transformative verbs, he contents himself with the conclusion that this is a fact of realization. One might have expected him to ask whether the aorist in -ην has a value of which the realization is incompatible with the meaning of non-transformative verbs, viz. a value excluding reference to the initial term of the action; and, if so, what this value is.

His use of quotations gives little room for criticism. Perhaps the difficulty of illustrating the neutral meaning of the present and aorist taken together as unmarked term in opposition to the perfect leads him to include some unsatisfactory examples of present and aorist with perfect meaning. In Hdt. iv. 190 θάπτονσι τοὺς ἀποθνήσκοντας (as in 180 τὰς δὲ ἀποθνησκούσας τῶν παρθένων . . . ψευδοπαρθένους καλέονσι which he does not cite) the use of the present participle may be not, as he thinks, a realization of its neutral value in opposition to the perfect, but of its positive value in opposition to the aorist, i.e. duration realized as repetition (so Macan, with different terminology!). In Thuc. v. 5. 1 ἐγένετο Μεσσήνη Λοκρῶν τινα χρόνον the aorist is not 'used as a perfect' (surely pluperfect?); it is a realization either of the neutral value (complexive) or of the negative value (punctual-finitive) with merely contextual implication of resulting state. *Od.* iv. 553 should not have been quoted without mention of its doubtful authenticity. There are some minor misprints and errors: p. 81, line 25 *no* omitted before *caracterizado*; p. 106, line 20 and note (4) *Dionisio* [sic] *Crono* (also in the index, p. 177); p. 121, line 7, a word omitted; p. 126, lines 17-18 ἀμφιπεριβήνθαι; p. 132, line 44 *atribuye*; p. 133, line 35 *κελετο*; p. 137, line 25 *ἐκάην* omitted after *aoristo*; p. 175, col. i, line 11 *exitir*.

It is no detraction from the importance and merit of Ruipérez's book that it suggests two fundamental questions to the classicist. First, can his method be applied with equal success to other departments of Greek grammar? The cases

may well prove less tractable than the verb. Second, are his formulations something more than a terminological innovation? Ruipérez is confident that the oppositions 'are a linguistic reality, not a mere method of classification', expressing the half-conscious or unconscious mental processes which determine the values of grammatical and other linguistic categories in relation to each other. It is earnestly to be hoped that he will not rest without testing his method over the whole domain of Greek grammar.

Westfield College, London

D. M. JONES

## INTENSIFICATION IN GREEK

HOLGER THESLEFF: *Studies on Intensification in Early and Classical Greek*. (Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum, xxi. 1.) Pp. 227. Helsinki: Academic Bookstore (Copenhagen: Munksgaard), 1954. Paper.

'INTENSIFICATION' is a vague term and Mr. Thesleff very properly introduces his work by explaining exactly what he means by it. He uses it in the restricted sense of intensifying meaning already inherent in words or expressions. The expression 'to love vehemently' implies intensification because the adverb intensifies the meaning inherent in the verb, but in such expressions as 'to walk quickly' there is strictly no intensification, because the adverb has a qualitative rather than an intensifying force. Thesleff does not confine his study to intensification in this narrower sense; he also discusses various forms of 'strengthening', a term which he uses in a wider sense than intensification. As there is no generally accepted terminology for this type of investigation, he has, to a great extent, had to select his own technical terms. These he explains clearly and gives references to his explanations in the index. It would, even so, have helped his readers if he had added a glossary.

The book is concerned with Greek literature up to about 350 B.C. It is divided into two parts of roughly equal length. The first deals with the adverbs *μάλα*, *πάνν*, *κάρτα*, *σφόδρα*, and *ἰσχυρῶς*. Thesleff briefly discusses the derivation, or probable derivation, of these words, states the number of times they occur in individual writers of this period, and gives a detailed classification of their use based on their function and on the kinds of words or expressions which they govern. An obvious difficulty of his method and one of which he himself is aware is that any classification of this kind must to a great extent be arbitrary. To take an example at random, in the sentence *καὶ μάλα ἀπορήσειν αὐτὸν προσδοκῶ* (Plato, *Laus* 810 c) *μάλα* might go with *καὶ* and have an affirmative force ('certainly'), it might intensify *ἀπορήσειν*, or it might intensify *προσδοκῶ*. It often seems doubtful whether one can profitably attempt to distinguish between an affirmative and an intensifying use. Many words and expressions which are not logically capable of intensification may be regarded by the writer as being so, just as we might describe an object as being 'very black'. In *κάρτα δ' ἐστ' ἐγγώριος* (Aeschylus, *Septem* 413) Thesleff considers *κάρτα* to have an affirmative sense ('truly'), but it seems equally justifiable to suppose that *ἐγγώριος* has a qualitative force which *κάρτα* intensifies. The same applies to several other examples which are classified under affirmative *κάρτα*. In spite of these limitations Thesleff's study of these words is valuable; his work is thorough and it shows clear thinking and sound judgement.

The second part of the book, which is of a more miscellaneous character, investigates various other methods of intensification. The use of the superlative, one of the most obvious types of intensification, is only briefly discussed, presumably because of Thesleff's intention to publish a separate work on this subject. Word-order, an important aspect of intensification, is not considered; the subject is probably too large and would not easily accommodate itself to the plan of this book. Treatment of intensifying particles is cursory, but there are references to Denniston's work. Miscellaneous minor omissions are the intensifying force of *ἀπό* in composition as in *ἀποβλέπω* (Thesleff only mentions its 'completive' force of 'wholly' or 'utterly'), and the use of *χρῆμα* with the genitive to denote a large number or quantity, which might have been included in the section headed 'expressions denoting quantity or extent in space'. There are inevitably other omissions, but Thesleff's treatment is on the whole comprehensive, certainly far more so than that of any other work on the subject. Many of his statements are matters of opinion and cannot be expected to win universal agreement. On more factual points he seems very sound. One might perhaps mention that on p. 150 he appears to misunderstand the meaning of *ἀέι* when he quotes *τῷ δὲ ἀέι ἡδίστῳ θηρεύεται* (Plato, *Gorgias* 464 d) as an example of its strengthening force with superlatives; here it has a limiting, rather than a strengthening force, i.e. 'what is most pleasant at the moment'.

The results achieved appear to justify the immense amount of work involved. Anyone interested in interpreting finer points of meaning in Greek will find it a useful reference book. Its author is thoroughly conversant with relevant works of linguistic research which he supplements and sometimes corrects. It is strange that his bibliography does not include more lexica to individual authors. Powell's *Lexicon to Herodotus* is there, but no others, not even Ast's *Lexicon Platonium* which must have been constantly at his elbow.

Thesleff's command of English is remarkable. Not only does he express himself clearly, but he can indicate the delicate distinctions which this kind of subject involves. He promises further works on kindred subjects. They are likely to be of importance.

King's College, Newcastle upon Tyne,  
University of Durham

H. LL. HUDSON-WILLIAMS

## A NEW TEXT OF TERENCE

P. Terenti Afri *Comoediae*. ed. SEXTUS PRETE. Pp. 430; 8 plates. Heidelberg: Kerle, 1954. Cloth, DM. 33 (paper, DM. 28).

DR. PRETE seems to have little acquaintance with early Latin metre. In the *Andria* alone he prints six or seven lines that will not scan, either at all (64; 536; 793; 945) or as indicated by his accents (650; 959; 978). Iambic senarii end in *abiisti mi* (*Heaut.* 818) and *meo fratre* (*Ad.* 40). In a note on *Heaut.* 6 *duplex quae ex argumento facta est simplici*, where A has *duplici*, he tells us of an Italian friend who defends the reading of the Bembinus and considers it of great importance for the understanding of *contaminatio*: neither Prete nor his unfortunate friend (who is about to publish a book on this subject) seems to be aware that *duplici* does not scan. Prete himself, by the way, prefers *simplici*, and this is how he explains the line: '*duplex, dum et Latina eadem et Graeca est*'.

As to Prete's knowledge of Latin, I quote: *abscribere* in the sense of 'to copy'

(p. 43); *quos paene legitur for apud quos legitur* (p. 55); *fieri potest ut . . . eum noverit eique codicem donaverit* (p. 12); *a scholiastis ipse putat textum prae oculis teneri qui lectiones correctoris recentis seu Jovialis affert* (p. 21); *corrector . . . quem recentem appellamus et saec. vii seu viii vixit* (p. 25); *novum specimen praebeo quo Terenti textus historiam antiqua aetate graphice indicatur; codex seu codicum familiarum . . . X appellamus* (p. 38); *ex sententiis quae Jachmann, Lindsay et Kauer, Marouzeau defendunt* (p. 39); *mihi videtur corruptelis seu lacunis hunc prologum expertum non esse* (p. 117); (Bentley made a conjecture) *hiati causa* (p. 338).

Labouring under these handicaps, Prete was not likely to produce a very good text of Terence. But he might perhaps have given us the full and reliable critical apparatus which we urgently need—if he had accuracy and knew how to go about his task. Not to select a particularly faulty passage, I reproduce five consecutive critical notes from the first page of the text proper, containing the beginning of the *Andria* prologue:

5 opera CPE<sup>2v</sup> 7 et ueteris E<sup>2</sup> 8 Nam quam E<sup>2</sup> nunc *codd.* Don.  
(‘nunc animadvertite’ non ‘nunc uitio dent’) dent rem D pro uitio E<sup>2</sup> aduor-  
tite ω Don. (legitur et ‘attentite’ unde manifestum est et ‘attendite’ et ‘advertite’ non esse  
plenum, nisi addideris ‘animum’) Prisc. II p. 357 (T. in A. ‘nunc animum advertite’)  
Nonius, p. 39, ‘animum adtendite’; edit. (praeter Mar.) 10 utrumuis D 11  
non ita dissimili sunt argumento sed tamen ω (sunt om. E) Don.; edit. verborum  
ordinem mutant: ita non Fleck. sunt dissimili Guy. Umpf. et tamen Eugr. Benl.  
Dz. Fleck. Linds. K. Mar. at tamen Hermann

To comment: 5 The information given is incomplete, inaccurate, and in one further point slightly misleading; incomplete because it is not mentioned that the rejected variant (*opera*) has the support of Donatus and Eugraphius<sup>(1)</sup>, while the reading preferred is attested also by Arusianus and Diomedes; inaccurate because *opera* is not the reading of C but, as Kauer–Lindsay state, of C<sup>2</sup>(<sup>2</sup>); and slightly misleading because the symbol E<sup>2</sup> should not be used for a fourteenth-century hand supplying a whole section missing in E.<sup>(3)</sup> Prete may mean to convey that the position in E is not the same as in D, where he uses D\* for the hand supplying the missing periocha, or, for example, in F, where he avoids the symbol F<sup>2</sup> in an analogous case by not mentioning the variants in *Eun.* 428; 432; 456; 457.<sup>(4)</sup> But he ought to have given an explanation. Until that is forthcoming I shall prefer Umpfenbach’s (D), (E), and (F).

8 ‘*codd. Don.*’ is rather misleading; why not ‘ω Don.’, as later in the same note? But if inconsistency is preferred, in spite of Prete’s promise on p. 43 that he will use *codd.* for *librorum consensus* (including A, which is here absent), and ω for *libri praeter A*, a comma after *codd.* would have prevented the reader from understanding *codices Donati*. ‘dent rem D’, placed as it is before instead of after ‘pro uitio E<sup>2</sup>’, states, wrongly, that D reads *quam dent rem uitio*. ‘aduortite ω Don.’:

(1) Lemmata only. The scholiasts’ lemma is of no significance where the Calliopians are undivided. Where they are divided it is *codicis instar*.

(2) If Dr. Prete refuses to believe that over the final -a a stroke is deleted, he ought to say so. The refusal might reasonably be based on the observation that in the first few pages of C the suspension is very rare and mainly restricted to line endings: 42; 98; 146; in the interior of the line 149 (end of verse);

171; 177.

(3) The symbol is explained at the foot of the periocha. It is a little unfortunate, however, that in the description of E on p. 43 a whole line, stating that *Andr.* 1–39 and the periocha of *Eun.* are missing, has dropped out.

(4) Why not mention them? They are almost contemporary and to a large extent identical with those of his favourite Bononiensis, of which we are spared no detail.

even in their summary apparatus L.-K. note that some manuscripts read -e- for -o-.

'attentite': *sic!* After reading the evidence for *aduortite* we are without warning brought face to face with the rival reading *adtendite*. This should have been printed in Roman type before 'Nonius'; as it is, 'editt.' does not convey clearly that they read *adtendite*. ('*praeter Mar.*'): Bentley also read *aduortite*. It is nowhere stated that *editt.* means editors of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The whole note, of course, is topsy-turvy and should read:<sup>(1)</sup> nunc ω *Don.* nam (E) pro uitio (E) quam uitio dent rem D adtendite *Nonius* 39 (. . .), *editt. plerique*; *aduortite* (-er-) ω, *Prisc. II.* 357 (. . .), *Bentl. Mar.*; *utrumque testatur Don.* (. . .).

10 *utrumuis* is not given by D (or by G to which Umpf., Mar. ascribed it).

11 E<sup>2</sup> has now become E through misprinting. The sentence '*editt. . . mutant*' is wholly redundant, and misleading as well since '*editt.*' in the apparatus means, or ought to mean, 'all editors'.

I turn to the last scene of the *Andria*, lines 957-981:

957-971 Prete does not record that in all these lines the first few letters are missing in A, a point of some interest in 959 and 961.

957 If the variant 'Da G' in the distribution of speakers was worth recording, it was necessary to state whether it refers to the first or the second speaker. The apparatus is unintelligible because it does not mention that many of the emendations cited are based on Hermann's transposition of *putet* into the following line.

962 Prete does not record that L and Eugraphius omit *mihi*, and that L omits *nunc*. For 'exoptem ω (*praet. L*) optem AL *Eugr. editt.*' read 'optem AL<sup>1</sup> *Eugr. editt. exoptem ω (praet. L<sup>1</sup>)*'.

963 'quid illud vel *Chremeti vel Davo dat Don.*': read '*vel Charino vel Davo*'. The error is copied from Marouzeau.

965 Prete does not record that Donatus agrees with δ (Wessner, *praef. p. xlviii*, Jachmann, *Gesch. d. Terentztextes*, 150) in making a new scene begin here.

967 Prete does not record that in C and P the second *n* of *nactus* is deleted (the other manuscripts are divided between *nactus* and *nactus*, and *natus*).

973 Prete writes *solus es* (with Bentley and some other editors) and records no variant. All manuscripts, with the sole exception of v<sup>2</sup>, read *solus est*. The error is all the more regrettable as v<sup>2</sup> is now rescued from isolation by the Oxyrhynchus papyrus which will be published shortly. Prete does not record the variant *dii diligent V*.

974 The statement that D has *conloquor* agrees with Marouzeau but contradicts Umpf. and L.-K. (*conloquor* D<sup>1</sup>); if the contradiction is deliberate, '*conloquor* D [*sic!*]' was called for. Prete does not record the variant *qui G*.

975 The note 'audistin ω' should follow the note which it precedes. The note 'om. Ab' rather obscures the fact that the Bononiensis is not the only companion of A in being free from the interpolation of *em* (or *hem*) but shares that distinction with D<sup>1</sup>. The remark '*rebus inducunt editt.*' is senseless and misleading since *rebus* is not read in A. The reader can gain this information from the preceding '*secundis rebus ω Don.*', provided he remembers that Prete has,

<sup>(1)</sup> If, that is, we accept Prete's method of recording editorial choices between variants, and if we consider (E) worth recording.

with P. FehI, abandoned the conventional symbol for the Calliopians and uses instead the symbol commonly denoting 'all MSS.'

977 Donatus is classed with the Calliopians as attesting *nos illum expectare* (*illum me expectare* Ab). Prete, though printing him correctly, does not observe that he has neither *me* nor *nos*.

978 In the text, unable to decide where to put the colon, Prete has left it out altogether. He records *dominum* (for *domum*) of V<sup>1</sup> but not *in domum* of L, witness perhaps of a common ancestor *domum*.

979 Prete does not record that C corrects *em* to *eam*.

980 The statement on the manuscripts supporting the attribution of this line to Pamphilus differs to some extent from Kauer's; if Prete deliberately contradicts Kauer, the insertion of [*sic!*] was called for. Or could room for this not be spared when Prete writes: '*versus 980-81 cantori tribuendos esse censet Speng. eius sententiam rectam iudicat Dz*', instead of '*980/1 cantori trib. Speng. plaud. Dz*.'?

981 Prete does not record the testimony of Servius or the fact that the reading of b is found in several manuscripts of Donatus.

I will not weary the reader with much further detail. It must be obvious that this large and beautifully produced book, which might have met the long-felt want of a full critical edition of Terence, on the count of accuracy alone is a catastrophic failure. Nor is there a streak of originality or critical ability anywhere, to offset, if not the inaccuracy, at any rate the muddle and confusion of the apparatus. Having read in *RE*<sup>2</sup> v. 649 and elsewhere that Dziatzko's is the best text of Terence, Prete clings to him rather more closely than to Lindsay or Marouzeau. He follows him even into writing *Nicaretus* for *Niceratus* in *Andr.* 87, although he mentions Lindsay's reference to Menander's *Νικηπατος*. Prete may well feel that he cannot be ludicrously wrong in the company of men like Umpfenbach, Fleckeisen, and Dziatzko. In this instance, however, he might have remembered that they were no longer in a position to recant when the *Samia* was published in 1907. Prete's only independent venture in the *Andria* is at 936, where he writes *veritust*. While I am certain that he is wrong, I cannot affirm that he departs from the manuscripts deliberately, since their reading (*est veritus*) is not recorded in the apparatus.

The apparatus is in the main compiled from Kauer's and Marouzeau's;<sup>(1)</sup> but it embodies also Prete's observations on the different hands in the corrections of A, set forth in *Il codice Bembino di Terenzio (Studi e Testi 153)*, 1950. The fact that they have little bearing on the constitution of the text, although, if correct, they would be important for its history, makes it unnecessary to comment on them here. But a thorough check by an expert would be welcome. The discovery of the alleged signature of Porcellius (£14, if I am not mistaken) in an

(1) The nature of the compilation and the progress of corruption are nicely illustrated by *Andr.* 926-8. In 926 two manuscripts omit the word *is*, and the fact is duly noted by Kauer. Marouzeau, transferring another *is* from the beginning of 928 to the end of 927, mistakenly applies Kauer's note to this second *is*. Prete has the best of both worlds, and records the omission in both places. But one such accident does not content him. Marouzeau, in making his transposition, stated, in essence correctly, that all

manuscripts had *is* in the beginning of 928. Prete maintains that all manuscripts have it in the end of 927 (and that Lindsay and Marouzeau [*sic!*] transfer it to the beginning of 927 [*sic!*]). After all this confusion it is perhaps no longer relevant to ask by what divine afflatus either of these scholars knows the line division of those manuscripts that have no line division. See also *Ad.* 996 where Kauer's apparatus grafted on Dziatzko's text grows strange fruit.



entry which seems to be in Bembo's hand (denied by Hauler in 1889<sup>(1)</sup>) but upheld by Lowe, *C.L.A.* i. 12) does not inspire much confidence. Prete does not claim to have closely examined any of the known Calliopians except C, D, E, and G. He has, however, collated a new manuscript from Bologna belonging to the early fourteenth century. Several manuscripts three or four hundred years older lie unused, but b with its thousands of senseless insertions, omissions, and transpositions is now fully recorded. Its only claim to distinction is that in a fair number of readings it agrees with A, against the Calliopians as recorded in our editions. A few samples, however, taken at random, confirm the suspicion (cf. p. 130, n. 4) that such readings are not uncommon in manuscripts of the fourteenth century, and significant only as potential clues to the history of the Bembinus in the early Renaissance. A flicker of hope that a useful reading might thus be preserved where A is no longer available is soon extinguished. It is true that, according to Prete, b has readings of its own at *Andria* 610 and 762; in fact, however, it shares them with p E  $\eta$  and the whole  $\delta$  class respectively.

Prete further publishes a collation of two manuscripts, referred to as b.c. and v.c., which is preserved in a copy at Florence of a sixteenth-century text of Terence. His identification of v.c. with the Basilicanus B is manifestly wrong, but it matters little. If anyone should ever be so foolish as to collate hundreds of manuscripts of Terence in an attempt to get some order into the late transmission, he might perhaps give a thought to b.c. and v.c. They are of no possible interest to anybody else.

Of the greatest interest, on the other hand, is the St. Gall palimpsest published by P. Lehmann in 1931. Its few lines (*Heaut.* 857-63; 875-8) throw much light on the history of the text. But our learned editor seems never to have heard of this, the oldest manuscript of Terence.

The publishers have spared neither labour nor expense: fount, layout, paper, reproductions (two each of A, C, V, and E), and binding are superb. Oh, the pity of it!

University College, London

O. SKUTSCH

### THE AD HERENNIIUM

[CICERO]: *Ad C. Herennium*. With an English translation by HARRY CAPLAN. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. lviii+433. London: Heinemann, 1954. Cloth, 15s. net.

WHILE the value for the modern reader of the rhetorical works of Cicero and Quintilian lies largely in their divergences from the Hellenistic tradition, though this remains their indispensable framework, the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* demands his attention as 'the most straightforward and sensible handbook of traditional rhetoric which has come to us from antiquity' (E. W. Bower in *C.R.* n.s. iv [1954], 270). The appearance of Caplan's edition, making the treatise easily accessible to all, and providing for the first time for those who read English but not Latin, is thus most welcome, all the more as this distinguished piece of work gives an excellent introduction to the whole field of rhetoric as well as much of value to the specialist.

The Introduction discusses sensibly, lucidly, and with masterly brevity the

<sup>(1)</sup> Also by Sabbadini (1932), as I learn from Dr. D. S. Duncan, who is shortly going to discuss this problem.

problems of the authorship and sources of the treatise. Caplan, rightly rejecting the attribution to Cornificius, follows those who with Marx assign the work to an *auctor incertus*. Though of course indebtedness to Marx is frequently apparent and acknowledged, he rejects, with most modern opinion, Marx's extreme charges of fraudulence and puerility against the *auctor*. In establishing his text, he shows the same inevitable debt, and the same reasonable independence, generally in preferring the more normal Latinity of the *expleti* against the *mutili* which Marx often followed as nearer to his conception of the writer's archaic and inadequate style. He makes some small changes of his own, e.g. on pp. 52, 218, 248, 364.

Most striking in this edition are the generous annotations on the scale of a miniature commentary. These generally are learned and helpful, providing the necessary guidance for those unfamiliar with the history and terminology of rhetoric, balanced summaries of controversial questions (e.g. the relations of Roman law and rhetoric, p. 90, and the 'characters of style', p. 252), and for those who wish to look further, an extensive bibliography. Those who hold that, in approaching any aspect of classical studies, a text with suitable commentary, where available, is worth a heap of handbooks and monographs will not easily find a better introduction to rhetoric than this edition.

It must, however, be mentioned that in the commendable attempt to acquaint the reader with the background of the work by frequent indications of the *auctor's* indebtedness to Greek rhetorical and philosophical doctrines and controversies, Caplan is on some large issues insufficiently cautious. (1) A minor instance is the isolated, baffling allusion to Analogy and Anomaly (p. 186 n.). (2) In citing Greek equivalents for Latin rhetorical terms, Caplan gives much that is useful and necessary, but sometimes exaggerates the Roman debt by giving rare words whose claim to a place in traditional rhetoric is doubtful, e.g. ἀκριβοδίκαιος, εὐθανασία, παραφθέγγεσθαι: the last (p. 18 n. a) is omitted from the index of Greek words, pp. 429 ff. (3) Caplan accepts the Rhodian origin of the treatise (p. xv) and some of his notes bear on this. But if with Caplan we reject a single immediate common source for *De Inv.* and *Ad Her.*, the hypothesis is unnecessary. The evidence for Rhodian influence on *Ad Her.* separately considered is slight, and the more pronounced Rhodian colouring of Cicero's work sufficiently explained by his connexion with the Rhodian rhetorician Molo. The common ground is due, as Caplan argues, to the use of earlier Latin handbooks. (4) Scholars are less and less ready to assert that the terms 'Atticism' and 'Asianism' have any application before the middle of the first century B.C. Whatever their later history, in origin they belong rather to the controversy in which Cicero became involved on returning from the Civil War. But Caplan favours the view which allows them earlier importance and much wider scope, and his observations on the subject should be regarded with caution. Thus Crassus' remark to Catulus (*De Orat.* iii. 188) that rhythm is not treated in *vulgari ista disciplina* is taken (p. 338 n. c) as alluding to Atticist neglect of prose-rhythm. But Atticism was anything but a *vulgaris disciplina*, and Crassus simply gives Cicero's own view on the neglect of rhythm—illustrated in *Ad Her.*—by ordinary rhetoricians.

Of the *auctor's* own use of *clausulae* no adequate study has ever appeared—Caplan's remarks are brief and traditional—though Bornecque made the important suggestion that *clausula*-analysis confirmed that some of the *auctor's* *exempla* were not his own composition. This touches a vexed point. Caplan in

his Introduction recognizes that the proem to Book iv, claiming originality for all *exempla* used, is a formal rhetorical exercise and not perhaps to be taken too seriously, but justly urges in extenuation of the *auctor's* notorious plagiarism that he probably regarded his own adaptations of his sources as sufficiently 'original'. *Clausula*-analysis tells us more here. From his proems and conclusions to each book, we know the *auctor's* personal preferences. Astonishingly, - - - - and - - - - - account for nearly two-thirds of the endings at main stops. The bulk of the work, offering less scope for 'fine writing', shows similar but less extravagant preferences. The *auctor* dislikes - - - - - and normally writes, for example, *videātūr ēssē*; when *esse videatur* occurs, *videatur* is emphatic, not the Ciceronian 'filler' (Caplan's n. on p. 299 misses this). He also dislikes the cretic in the last place, which Cicero much affects. Now the *exempla*, if original, should show high rhythmical elaboration, except in special circumstances, e.g. illustration of the *genus tenue*. But in fact, taken as a whole, they do not. This seems to confirm what Caplan implies (p. 264 n. c), that all except some special *exempla* were borrowed. But looked at individually—and the *auctor's* pronounced preferences reduce the hazards involved in drawing conclusions from short passages and isolated sentences—the *exempla* reveal an unmistakable pattern. Those referring to datable events, providing a date *post quem* for the whole work (Marx saw in many of these indebtedness to collections of declamations), as well as those which are obviously or probably borrowed from known sources, tend not to show the *auctor's* favoured rhythms, nor do those which are paralleled in Latin, unless specially adapted. The rhythmical *exempla* are marked by lack of particularity of content, and, stylistically, by the *hyperbata* noted by Golla as an idiosyncrasy of the *auctor*. Here is neither space nor occasion for the detailed evidence, or for conjectures on the *auctor's* motives in individual cases. But we may deduce that unless the *auctor* had a gift for rhythm unique in his time, the borrowed *exempla* are older than his own, and that he not only, as is obvious, worked over old lecture-notes and handbooks, but that he probably did so after a considerable lapse of time and not as a young student. Why then should we date the work to 86–82? Quite apart from the evidence just given, the assumption that textbooks, of all genres the most conservative, will reflect near-contemporary conditions is gratuitous. Resemblances to *De Inv.* prove nothing. Traditional rhetoric changed little and slowly, as Cicero's mature works show, so far as they are relevant, and even Quintilian, who probably did not know *Ad Her.*, actually uses identical wording on some traditional matters. The *auctor's* claims to innovation, even without allowance for exaggeration, again are unhelpful in the absence of related evidence. Clumsiness of style proves only the inexperience of the writer. The *exemplum* which implies juries of senators and knights (iv. 47 with Caplan's note) has been held to suggest the period 89–82, the upper limit being brought down to 86 by the mention of the death of P. Sulpicius in 87 (i. 25). But after 70 B.C. Cicero often refers to those two classes only, ignoring the *tribuni aerarii* (cf. How, *Select Letters of Cicero*, ii. 78), so that the *exemplum*, which shows the marks of the *auctor's* own composition, might belong after 70 B.C. and still reflect contemporary conditions. How long after 70? Until the time when the writer of a textbook *must* have acknowledged Cicero and his contemporaries as models instead of stopping with Crassus and Antonius (iv. 7), and alluded to the events of the Ciceronian Age as subjects for declamation, and when *declamatio* itself acquired the later sense not found in *Ad Her.* (cf. Bonner, *Roman Declamation*, pp. 20–29).

This date may be hard to define: but can we certainly assert of the *Ad Her.* that 'of extant complete (Latin) prose works only Cato's *De Agri Cultura* is older' (p. xxxii, n. b)?

Caplan's translation is clear, concise, and, a few angularities apart, as elegant as the subject-matter and manner of his original allows. The difficult task of rendering illustrations of stylistic and other features he discharges well. Only rarely is his accuracy or judgement questionable; e.g. p. 173 as a rendering of *non immortalitatem neque aeternam incolumitatem*, 'neither immortality nor a life everlasting' is misleading, particularly in view of the associations of the inversion; p. 193 *integri* is probably 'unharméd', not 'complete'; p. 343, *rem*, 'point at issue', not 'subject'; p. 367, *vilae discrimen*, 'hazard of life', rather than 'crisis'; on p. 200, *iubemur* is printed, but the translation represents *iubemus* of some manuscripts. I have observed but one misprint: *is* for *si* on p. 166.

University of Southampton

A. E. DOUGLAS

## SALLUST

LAURA OLIVIERI SANGIACOMO: *Sallustio*. Pp. vi+310. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1954. Paper, L. 1200.

THIS is the first comprehensive work on Sallust in twenty-five years, if one sets aside Bolaffi's *Sallustio e la sua fortuna nei secoli* (1949), which devotes itself more specifically to the questions of Sallust's place in the stream of Roman historiography and his influence on European literature. As a survey of recent controversy on the subject, the present volume could hardly be bettered. There are chapters on the *Epistles*, the *Catiline*, the *Jugurtha*, and the *Histories*, as well as on the biographical material and on Sallust as an historian. The writer's bibliographical training has enabled her to assemble and present with skill the conflicting views on Sallust, maintaining a judicial calm which is all the more admirable in that her own sympathies are heavily engaged. On the question of Sallust Miss Sangiacomo is a fundamentalist. She ranges and dusts the images in the Sallustian shrine, pausing in this labour of love only to return with vigour some stones recently thrown over the garden wall by E. Howald (*Vom Geist antiker Geschichtsschreibung*, 1944, pp. 141-62). She is the latest adherent to the movement to re-establish Sallust begun thirty-five years ago by Funaioli in his article in *R.-E.* For her Sallust is the supreme artist, uniquely able to evoke the past in words (*exaequare facta dictis*), words from which his own personality shines forth bright and clear for all except the wilfully blind to see.

The plan of the work, we are told, has been to establish a 'solid biographical foundation', to reconstruct on it the personality of the historian, and from that to deduce the significance of his work. She elaborates two main themes. The first of these, on the political or historical level, is the development of Sallust's thought from the comparatively naïve belief that all the world's woes are directly caused by one's political opponents, to the more mature (or disillusioned) view of the *Histories* that the cause is rather the natural wickedness of human nature. The second, on the artistic level, is that the unique features of Sallust's presentation and style are the reflection of an inner emotional conflict, the excited, nervous style corresponding to Sallust's tortured, agonizing attitude towards Rome's troubles and, at a lower level, towards his own frustrated

political ambitions. With these keys the significance of his work can be unlocked.

We immediately ask ourselves where the material for this 'solid biographical basis' is to come from, particularly when much of the contemporary evidence has to be discounted, we are told, as partisan and hostile. The writer gives the answer herself (p. 15): 'Research on Sallust can only achieve results through the analysis of the moral, logical, and aesthetic atmosphere of his written works.' As one might expect, the 'solid biographical basis' turns out to be the point of an inverted pyramid, and the writer develops her theme by arguments from internal evidence. The value of this internal evidence is enhanced by a belief in the strong individuality of Sallust's writing (which not everybody shares), and its scope is obviously much enlarged by accepting both *Epistles* as genuine. (Even the *Invective against Cicero*, relegated to an appendix, is saved by a last-minute reprieve.) This is, on the whole, a work for the faithful. Infidels will not be converted. On occasion the work seems to suffer from a certain brevity. The problem of the dedication of Varro's *Pius aut de pace* is not even hinted at; and the mention (p. 21) of Bolaffi's recent discovery in the sixteenth-century writer Pontano of a reference to Sallust as the author (or translator) of an *Empedoclea* is misleadingly brief; one naturally assumes that Pontano derives from the disputed passage in Cic. *ad Q. fr.* ii. 9. 3, but Miss Sangiacomo is plainly quoting him as supporting evidence for her interpretation of that passage, without, however, reproducing Bolaffi's very essential argument in support of this.

At one point the author's insight into the mind of Sallust seems, rather alarmingly, to transcend syntax: the phrase *iners imbellis* (*Jug.* 44. 1) is not applied to the proconsul Albinus, but only to his army. An equal sense of unease is caused by the writer's apparent unfamiliarity with some of the common coin of Roman history, e.g. her frequent use of the term 'plebeian' as if it were a significant description, and her constant reference to Sallust as a *novus homo*, which in the stricter sense, not having attained the consulship, he never was, and which is hardly a happy epithet for a man who so conspicuously failed to achieve success in politics.

There is an excellent bibliography, arranged chronologically, a subject index, and an index of passages cited. The printed page is too often disfigured by intrusive black rule-lines, and the printer's inferiority complex over Greek quotations reaches its climax on p. 253, where ἀπερὶ is first mis-spelt and then (presumably to conceal the fact) printed upside down.

University of Birmingham

D. A. MALCOLM

## ITALIC DIALECTS

GINO BOTTIGLIONI: *Manuale dei Dialecti Italici (Osco, Umbro e dialetti minori): grammatica, testi, glossario con note etimologiche*. Pp. xxii+455; 15 plates. Bologna: S.T.E.B., 1954. Paper, L.5,000.

THIS handbook follows the usual plan. A short chapter introduces the languages and gives an account of the most important documents. The treatment of the grammar is descriptive and historical rather than comparative. It is the author's expressed purpose not to force into neat schemes facts which are often isolated, vague, or contradictory. This principle is commendable, but sometimes

leads him too far in renouncing even reasonable possibilities of classification, as in the sections on the change of *ō* to *ū* and on anaptyxis, especially in groups consisting of a liquid or nasal followed by a consonant. The section on sonants defines them in a way irrelevant to Indo-European and deals with the vocalic liquids and nasals under the same rubric as consonantal *i* and *u*. The treatment of the *rs* groups does not distinguish clearly between them and omits the important example O. *φεροποι*. The morphology is in general well ordered and full. Bottiglioni follows tradition in stating that in Italic, as in Latin, five declensions can be distinguished; yet he is obliged to separate the consonant stems and *i*-stems of the Third Declension, thus implicitly admitting six declensions. The sections on indeclinabilia and the chapter on syntax are full and amply illustrated. The selection of texts is admirable, including not only Oscan in the narrower sense and Umbrian, but also the lesser dialects. The printing of the texts in their original lines makes reference much easier and quicker than in Buck's and Vetter's handbooks. The size of the volume does not give much room for commentary, and perhaps too much of the task of interpretation is assigned to an interlinear translation into the kind of Latin usual in Oscan-Umbrian handbooks, a Latin in which too often the vague glosses the unintelligible. An interesting example is to be found on p. 294, where the mysterious U. *disleralinsust* is translated 'delerus licuerit', and this in turn explained in a footnote as 'Sarà ritenuto, rimarrà estraneo alla cerimonia'. References to the literature on obscure and controversial passages are generously given. Bottiglioni is eclectic in his interpretations; mostly conservative in comparison with Vetter and Pisani, he often attaches himself to Ribezzo and Pighi. He shows good judgement in what he accepts from Vetter (e.g. the latter's version of I.T. Ib 40 **pustertiu pane**. . . as 'on the third day after . . .'), and has here and there a good deal of his own to offer, especially an interesting, though admittedly provisional, version of the Tabula Veliterna. The vocabulary, though fully referenced and provided with etymological notes, has two inconveniences. One is the dispersion of single words under a number of entries (e.g. the verb *opsā* under *osatu*, **upsatuh**, **űpsannam**); the other is the placing of all references for a given word at the end of the article on it, including those relevant not to the word as a whole but only to one form or use of it. The etymological notes do not always justify the claim made in the preface, that they dispense the reader from consulting the *Altitalisches Wörterbuch* of F. Müller Jzn; as examples may be cited those on *comenei*: 'Cfr. lat. *communis*'; on *dersa*: 'Cfr. lat. *do* e *dedo*, gr. *δίδωμι*' (*dedo* here preferably a misprint for *dēdi* than a misleading and irrelevant *dēdo*); on *ecla*: 'Da \**ek-*, cf. ai. *eka* s "unus"'. The book ends with some excellent photographs of specimen texts; these are clear enough to enable the reader to decide for himself whether he agrees with Bottiglioni's reading **űsurs** in his no. 27, 2, in § 121 and the Vocabulary, or with the usual reading **usurs**, which Bottiglioni keeps (accidentally?) in § 122. These plates and the map are in keeping with the clear and agreeable format of the whole volume.

In reviewing a handbook of this sort, it is always possible to find a few points of disagreement with the author respecting his arrangement of the material or his treatment, necessarily summary, of difficult and controversial issues. Such criticisms need not be taken as detracting from the merit of the work. Unfortunately, this book is marred by an extraordinary carelessness. This is manifest not only in misprints, of which there is a fair number, but also in omissions,



inconsistencies, and misleading or erroneous statements which cannot, in the case of so well-informed and up-to-date a scholar, be the result of ignorance. Particularly irritating is the frequent and capricious omission of marks of vowel quantity; flagrant examples are *ɣ*, *l* denoting long sonants (p. 62) and the imperative endings spelled *-tod*, *-tota* (p. 139-40; contrast *sēdeo* p. 54!). There are many important details on which the reader will look in vain for enlightenment: the retention of the group *ps* in U. *opset*; the formation of O. *εσοτ*; O. *sim* 'sum'; U. *manf* (acc. pl.); U. *uestis*, parsed as a present participle in the Vocabulary but not explained; the *-s* of U. *abrons* (acc. pl.). Among errors of commission stand out: Lat. *emendauit* quoted with *commendauit* as an example of vowel-weakening in contrast to O. *aamanaffed* (p. 25); O. *fu(u)trei* derived from the root *\*bhū-* (p. 35; correct in the Vocabulary); O. *pruffed* translated 'probauit' (p. 46; elsewhere 'posuit'); *τεκ-εἰν τίκ-τω* (*sic*), *τέ-τοκ-α*, misleading, to say no worse, as an example of vowel-gradation (p. 53); U. *kapiře*, *nomne* as exemplifying the loss of final *-d* (p. 84). Worst of all are those instances in which the reader is left to flounder among a number of more or less irreconcilable explanations of the same phenomenon. For U. *revestu* the following etymologies are given: '< \*reueisētōd' (p. 52); '< \*re-ueds-to, cfr. lat. *uiso* < \*ueid-so' (p. 73); '< \*ueid-s-tōd' (p. 424). U. *antervakaze*, *anderuacose*, consistently translated at each occurrence 'intermissum sit', is given in the Vocabulary as 3rd sg. perf. ind. pass.; yet for etymology is given '*anter-vakaz* < \**uakat(i)s*', which seems to be a *nomen actionis* in *-ti* (what then is the *-e*?); whereas on p. 132, among examples of verbs with present stems in *-ā*, occurs '*anter-vakaze* < \**anter-vacat-se*'; is this hypothetical form to be taken as 3rd sg. pres. ind. act. with appended reflexive pronoun? In the section on numerals the basic form for 'ninth' is given as \**noyen-o*, in the Vocabulary s.v. *nuvmie* as \**noue-mo*, with cognate OInd. *novamā-* (*sic*). O. *manafum*, though according to Bottiglioni a perfect, is said to exemplify the primary ending of the 1st sg. (p. 131); yet the next sentence but one might be understood to imply that it had the secondary ending, and in any case contains the astounding statement that U. *aseriaia* has final *-a* from *-m*. On p. 132 the Umbrian verb *portā-* is stated to belong to the First Conjugation, and its attested forms, including the subjunctive *portaia*, are listed in the paradigm of the First Conjugation (pp. 141 ff.); yet, in a paragraph on the formation of the present subjunctive (p. 138) *portaia* is given among the forms of the other conjugations, and the fact that in Umbrian the first as well as the other conjugations forms an *ā*-subjunctive is ignored, even (no doubt inadvertently) denied by implication.

These examples, though perhaps the worst, are but a selection of the blemishes which could be cited. It is most regrettable that a book so well planned, so attractively produced, and by a scholar of Bottiglioni's standing, should be thus disfigured.

Westfield College, London

D. M. JONES

## THE HISTORY OF RELIGIONS

RAFFAELE PETTAZZONI: *Essays on the History of Religions*. Translated by H. J. ROSE. (Studies in the History of Religions, i.) Pp. viii+225; 12 plates. Leiden: Brill, 1954. Cloth, fl. 26.50.

THE Professor of the History of Religions in the University of Rome himself

explains the principle which guided this selection from his published writings: it was 'to prefer those which seemed . . . best fitted to give an idea of the subjects which have principally interested me during the last forty years, and of the wider researches which I have devoted to those subjects in works on a larger scale'. The volume is, in fact, the author's personal anthology of his own work.

Of the nineteen essays, ranging in length from six to fifteen pages, ten are of more or less direct classical interest. In no. vi, Pettazzoni maintains that all the references to confession of sins in classical authors deal with oriental practices, except for the suggested existence of confession on Samothrace, which he traces to the 'Pelagic' substratum there. No. vii is the introduction to the second edition of Pettazzoni's *La religione nella Grecia antica fino ad Alessandro*. No. viii interprets the three deities worshipped, according to Herodotus (v. 7), by the Thracians, Ares, Artemis, and Dionysus, as the Sky-god, the Earth-mother (= Bendis), and their son; 'Hermes', worshipped, according to Herodotus, by the 'kings' only, and regarded by them as their ancestor, is the Sun-god. This last interpretation is supported by a discussion of the 'Thracian Rider', a figure which clearly has solar connexions and which Pettazzoni believes to be the Sun-god who was identified with Hermes. The Rider is sometimes given the epithet ἀρχηγός or ἀρχηγέτης, which Pettazzoni (p. 89) seems to interpret as 'ancestor', considering that it was this aspect which led to the identification of him with Hermes, whose 'ithyphallic shape' he relates to 'his functions of generation and procreation'. But the transition from the familiar concept of Hermes as fertility-god to the suggested concept of him as ancestor-god would require more development than it here receives. (Pettazzoni also invokes the epithet πατριός or πατρώος, but that denotes the Rider as 'the ancestral', not as 'the ancestor'.)

No. ix, on 'The Wheel in the Ritual Symbolism of some Indo-European Peoples', interprets as solar symbols the *summanalia*, mentioned by Festus, the *orbes aenei* kept in the sanctuary of Semo Sancus, the *urfeta* mentioned (with no indication of its precise character or form) in the Iguvine Tables (ii b), and various objects from non-classical environments. The case is far from proven. *Urfeta*, for example, may be the same word as *orbita*, but *orbita* does not mean 'a wheel', as Pettazzoni seems to suppose, and it is certainly going beyond the evidence to assert (p. 96) that 'this *urfeta* (cf. Latin *orbita*, *orbis*) was therefore a ritual object . . . shaped like a wheel, and thus similar in form to Semo Sancus', *orbes aenei*, and to the *summanalia in modum rotae fincta*'. No. x interprets the goddess Carmenta as a Moon-goddess and her cult-titles *Prorsa* and *Postvorta* (and their variants) as references to the crescent-moon facing east and west. No. xii is a convincing interpretation of the passage in the *Germania* (39. 1-5) on the sacred grove of the Semnones, which includes the words *ibi regnator omnium deus, cetera subiecta atque parentia*, which Pettazzoni explains to mean 'there (in the sacred grove) the god is absolute ruler, all else (*cetera*, correlative to *deus*) is subject and obedient (to the divine sovereignty)'.

Nos xiv-xvi, 'Sarapis and his "Kerberos"', 'Aion-(Kronos) Chronos in Egypt' and 'The Monstrous Figure of Time in Mithraism', are by-products 'of a scheme of research on the religious forms of the ideas of time and eternity in the ancient world . . . to be published in book form in *Studies of the Warburg Institute*'. No. xviii, 'State Religion and Individual Religion in the Religious History of Italy', is a journalistic treatment of the affair of the Bacchanalia in

186 B.C., leading on to an account of the subsequent history of the clash between the two forms of religion. Pettazzoni has constituted himself the defender of the worshippers of Bacchus. Unfortunately, his enthusiasm leads him into rash and careless statement. 'One of the first pages of the history of religion in Italy is written in blood' is a fine sentence, but religion had a long history in Italy before 186 B.C. The *Liberalia* is displaced from 17 to 27 March on p. 204. On p. 206 the speech ascribed by Livy to the consul Postumius is cited as expressing the religious duality between the Bacchanalia and the state-religion, and then we are told that 'it is no great matter that this speech was not really delivered in these terms by the consul, but is, in this form, the composition of Livy himself'.

Of the essays on non-classical topics we may mention no. i, in which Pettazzoni, distinguishing between monotheism and belief in a supreme deity, rejects the idea of primitive monotheism and also that of monotheism in ancient Greece. (On p. 5 there is a strange confusion between the historian of Greek religion having a clear idea of what monotheism is, and the Greeks themselves having a clear idea of it.) In no. ii, on 'The Truth of Myth', there is an interesting treatment of the significance of 'true' and 'false' as applied by primitive peoples to their stories, vitiated, for the uninformed, by a neglect to examine or even to quote the words which are rendered by 'true' and 'false'. (On p. 16 the undoubted etymological connexion of *fabula* with *fatum* is wrongly taken to show that *fabula* may be 'a secret and potent force, akin, as its very etymology shows, to the power of the *fa-tum*'.)

There are many misprints and occasional awkwardnesses and inelegancies of expression. On p. 82, for example, we have 'translations of divine names can be no more than approximate, not so much, or not only, owing to insufficient knowledge . . . as, or also, because of the real difference between the divine figures thus interpreted, which never agree exactly in all their aspects, but only in part and in some of them, precisely those which give rise to the differing interpretations'. 'Thus' and 'so' and 'consequently' are sometimes peculiarly used: for example, to find the point of reference of a 'thus' on p. 45, we have to go back more than a page. Again, on p. 117 we have 'it is true that we have other instances of two festivals with three days between them . . . and so this must have been a favourite arrangement, to judge by its frequency'.

But this is, perhaps, to carp. The volume is a stimulating collection of papers, a fitting tribute by the publishers to their learned and distinguished author.

Queen's University of Belfast

M. J. BOYD

## ATTIC VASE PAINTINGS

J. D. BEAZLEY: *Attic Vase Paintings in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston*. Part ii. Pp. viii+103: 34 plates in portfolio, 12 supplementary plates with the text. London: Oxford University Press, 1954. £8. 8s. net.

THE second part of the publication of the Attic vases in Boston is once again devoted to red-figure. It contains a rich array, covering the century from 520 B.C. onward; forty-four vases and some fragments, including a few pieces not in the Museum of Fine Arts which are adduced for comparison. There is a balanced variety of shapes; in quality the greatest strength inevitably lies in the earlier vases. The backbone is a group of cups by the Panaitios painter, or

related to him, and the bell-krater from which the Pan painter gets his name; after such works as these the ruminant dignitaries of the Niobid painter and his associates make a weak showing, and among the vases of the Classical period many readers will prefer the less pretentious pieces, such as those by the Penthesilea painter, or the two oinochoai which conclude the series. The subjects are well diversified. Deities and mythical characters make up the majority of the scenes, pride of place going to incidents from myth and legend; Danae and Acrisius (69); epic combats between Achilles and Memnon and Diomedes and Aeneas (70); and a fragmentary Death of Pentheus, especially noteworthy as the earliest known representation of the story (66). A minority of the pictures deal with the human world; the palaestra, the komos, warriors in action or setting out for the field. Here the choice of theme is more restricted, but since this group include the Panaitian cups, quality compensates for the limitation of interest.

From the text the reader derives pleasure and profit which increase on closer study. Each vase has its bibliography; there follows an account of the picture or pictures; where there are many figures, intricate detail, or an interesting or difficult subject, the text is full, though never otiose; for simple, straightforward scenes the treatment is suitably laconic. A wide range of comparative material of all kinds—sculpture, gems, and coins, as well as vases—is adduced in the examination of scenes, characters, and the poses of individual figures; in addition there is extensive and illuminating use of ancient authorities. Among the more lengthy studies one may note in particular 70, which includes an important contribution to the iconography of the two subjects represented; 99, with a judicious re-examination of the problems presented by the series of pictures of epicene revellers; and 94, the krater with the Death of Actaeon on one side and on the other a pastoral scene (so also, perhaps, Virgil, *Eclogues* ii. 33). Incidentally, the traditional explanation of the reverse hardly accounts for the presence of the herm, or for the flavour of comedy. Might it not be that the youth, performing some act of cult or worship before the herm, has elicited a direct response from the powers of Nature?

As one would expect, there is an ample harvest for the student of style; the field is not confined to the Boston collection alone, since many of the entries include additions and supplements to *A.R.V.* Especially valuable are the sentences in which the author modifies or elaborates an earlier view, or defines the essential features of an artist's work; these passages are so illuminating that one is eager for more. Very often the stylistic links which unite a group of vases are unequivocal, but there are border-line cases, when it is hard to decide whether a work is or is not by a given artist, or to which of two closely related hands it is best assigned; at such times the judgement of an authority is an invaluable guide, yet the summing-up can assist the reader in his endeavours towards the same conclusion. Similarly, a little more might have been said on the dating of some pieces; for instance, the first two vases in the book are dated 520–510 and 520–515 B.C. respectively, and in the Panaitian group earlier and later works are distinguished. Not everyone can perceive and interpret without assistance the subtle differences in style and drawing upon which close dating of this kind depends.

The illustrations are of generous size, in accordance with the programme set out in the introduction to the first volume. In an ideal world one might have asked for more photographs of details as a check (for the most self-effacing

draughtsman cannot but infuse a tinge of his own personality into his copies), but the consequent increase in the number of plates would certainly have made the cost prohibitive. The quality of the reproductions, though not faultless, is well up to contemporary standards.

In sum, an admirable work, and one looks forward to the appearance of the third volume.

*British Museum*

P. E. CORBETT

## GREEK CONCEPTIONS OF PORTRAITURE

GISELA M. A. RICHTER: *Greek Portraits*. A Study of their Development. (Collection Latomus, xx.) Pp. 50; 10 plates. Brussels: Latomus, 1955. Paper, 80 B.fr.

WHAT is a portrait? What, in this context, do we actually mean by 'likeness' and by 'realistic' and 'individualised', by 'idealised' and 'generalised'? These questions are fundamental to the study of iconography in any age or clime; and it would have helped if, in this pleasantly written and well-illustrated sketch of the development of Greek portraits, beginning with the first half of the fifth century B.C., such terms could have been somewhat more closely defined. For a work of art to be a portrait, as distinct from any other carved or painted image, it must fulfil a number of concurrent conditions. It must be meant to depict a specific individual, and it must do so in such a way that he, and he alone, is recognizable in it; we must not be able to mistake him for anyone else; it is not enough to give a particular name to some otherwise undifferentiated face or figure. 'The representation of an individual' is thus not an adequate definition (p. 12), as is indeed admitted later on in the brochure, where Cleobis and Biton and their like are called 'ostensibly portraits' (p. 15). Furthermore, the subject's personality must be expressed in the record of his own peculiar features, of his facial oddities, if he has them, of the stamp made upon him by his age at the moment chosen for portrayal and by his social status or race. Again, it is not enough to show naturalistic traits suggestive of character or individuality, if no specific human person is in question.

A 'realistic likeness' must show an identifiable individual as he actually appears or appeared: it cannot, of its nature, be other than 'individualised', that is, mirroring a special man or woman. How, then, can realistic likenesses ever be 'types rather than individualised human beings' (p. 12)? A type, or idea of a class of men, can be 'realistic' in the sense of showing very faithfully, in detail, how Nature works: but it is not the likeness of a concrete person.

Nor is an imaginary portrait, of someone of whose appearance no record exists (of Homer, for example), a likeness, as Dr. Richter describes it (p. 24). However inspired and spiritualized (fifth-century B.C. type) or however vivid and naturalistic (Hellenistic type) it may be, it is not like any actual person, but reflects the artist's idea of a famous character. The Ostia Themistocles may well be, up to a point, such a 'portrait'; although Dr. Richter claims it as a more or less contemporary realistic likeness of the first half of the fifth century—as such, quite unique, it seems, for the equal of its face was never seen, so far as we know, before the Hellenistic period. Its fifth-century structure and details could have been consciously reproduced by a late-Hellenistic sculptor and combined with 'fancy', individual-looking traits, and 'realistically' conceived features—coloured, perhaps, by some tradition about the statesman's appearance.

An 'idealised' portrait is also not a portrait in the full sense. In the well-known head of Pericles, for instance, the individual is there, but completely in the background, virtually absorbed in the ideal *strategos* and in the spirit of the age and city which he represented.

Again, it is of the essence of a likeness to be 'intimate', close to its subject: it cannot, strictly speaking, be 'generalised' (cf. pp. 28, 33). A 'generalised' representation, as in the fourth century B.C., gives us the 'conception' of a man from which all specific, individual idiosyncracies are absent; and in ancient Greece the 'conception' of the same national hero could vary markedly from generation to generation.

In the Greek world *true* portraiture began not in the fifth century, but perhaps in the fourth century with such consciously 'characterised' portrait-types as that of Socrates and with the work of Demetrius of Alopeke (if we can accept at its face value the literary tradition about him), certainly with Alexander and with Polyeuctus' statue of Demosthenes, made within living memory of the orator's actual appearance. It continued, in the iconography of Hellenistic worthies, above all in the royal coin-portraits—portraits (mostly executed long before the Roman period) in which the body plays no part at all; and it reached its zenith in those amazingly 'veristic' likenesses of priests, magistrates, private citizens of both sexes—fashioned in Egypt (p. 42), Athens, Delos, and other centres—from which the Roman portrait-art of the late Republic was directly derived.

Newnham College, Cambridge

J. M. C. TOYNBEE

## GREEK INDEPENDENCE

GEORGES TÉNÉKIDÈS: *La notion juridique d'indépendance et la tradition hellénique*. (Collection de l'Institut Français d'Athènes.) Pp. 210; 14 plates. Athens: Institut Français, 1954. Paper.

The author of this work, who is a professor of international law, addresses it primarily to jurists interested in international relations and not *aux seuls hellénistes* (p. 2). It is not clear whether his legal readers are or are not expected to be familiar with Greek. Of the many passages quoted from ancient authorities most are translated, but some, including several of importance, are not. He states (p. 197) that he has made frequent use of the best-known French translations, but it is surely where he quotes from works of which there is no well-known French translation, such as those of Diodorus, Pausanias, and the 'Old Oligarch', that readers with little Greek will need help, and yet in these cases no translations are given.

There are defects of method in other directions. The author is evidently interested in bibliography (cf. p. 144 n. 4, where he cites an article that he has published in a bibliographical periodical): his knowledge of modern works dealing with various aspects of his subject is extensive and up to date, though he seems to have missed *A.T.L.* He tends, however, to load his footnotes with lists of modern works (occasionally without a page reference) of which some are only remotely relevant to the topic under discussion and lend little or no support to his argument. He is also inclined to rely too much upon the views of others: a discussion of *παρὰ τὸ καθ' ἑαυτὸν* in Thuc. i. 98. 4 consists largely of a survey of modern opinions (pp. 20–22), and though he states which of the two



explanations he prefers, he fails to give adequate reasons for his choice. On p. 27, n. 3, after quoting from Gomme's *Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, he adds the puzzling reference 'Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*, 1932, pp. 460-461'. The puzzle is solved by a glance at the relevant page of Gomme, where after the sentence quoted by Ténékidès appears 'Meyer, *G.G.A.*, 1932, 460-1'.

There is much unnecessary repetition. A sentence from the treaty between Athens and Selymbria (Tod, 88) is quoted four times (p. 34, n. 2; p. 66, n. 1; p. 111; p. 162), and although the full text of the alliance between Athens and Rhegium (which should have been described as a renewal) is given on the third page of plates, parts of it are quoted elsewhere (p. 46, n. 1; p. 180). There is a strange case of duplication and inconsistency on the question whether the Chalcidian League was dissolved by Sparta in 379: on p. 82, n. 1, Ténékidès states that it was dissolved, though he mentions the contrary view of J. Hatzfeld, but on p. 155, n. 5, referring to an earlier publication in which Hatzfeld puts forward this same view, he is inclined to accept it. His practice of including in his footnotes lengthy quotations from modern works (cf. p. 27, n. 2, from Glotz-Cohen, *Histoire Grecque*) is presumably adopted for the benefit of jurists who may be unfamiliar with standard works on Greek history and political institutions. To readers to whom they are easily accessible this practice is irritating. The book is in substance a small one and could have been improved by pruning. Its arrangement, though highly schematic, is not always easy to follow. The final chapter begins as though designed to be exclusively a summary of conclusions, but subsequently new topics are introduced, and there are long footnotes on the Aetolian, Cretan, and Achaean Leagues (p. 173, n. 6; p. 175, n. 4) which could well have been discussed earlier.

Ténékidès scarcely exercises sufficient caution when dealing with secondary authorities and seems to regard all ancient evidence as being of equal value. In his discussion of the Delian Confederacy he starts with Plutarch, *Aristeides* (p. 53), and he does not appear to have asked himself whether terms such as 'autonomy' and 'democracy' had precisely the same meaning for Diodorus as they had for Thucydides. He also refers to documents quoted by Thucydides as though the historian wrote them himself (p. 8) and to opinions expressed in Thucydidean speeches as though they were necessarily those of the historian (p. 114, n. 2). Although the plates (mostly of coins) are pleasantly decorative, some are concerned with matters not discussed elsewhere, and they show that more use could profitably have been made of numismatic evidence. The index omits a number of important place-names.

These faults of technique lessen but do not by any means destroy the value of the book for *hellénistes*. While its conclusions are not strikingly novel, it is of great interest to see how the familiar problems of Greek inter-state relations are treated by an expert on international law. If some of his technical terms are unfamiliar, his modern parallels are most illuminating. He divides his work into two sections, namely 'La notion de l'indépendance dans la Grèce des cités' and 'Les raisons de l'indépendance hellénique'. In the first, after examining the various terms denoting independence, he proceeds to discuss its legal and moral principles, the origin and organization of various leagues, and the ways in which the formation of leagues could lead to imperialism and loss of independence. In the second section he puts forward five reasons why the maintenance of independence was so vitally important to Greek cities; that without it federations could not operate as they should, peace could not easily

be maintained, democracy could not function, a healthy foreign policy could not be exercised, and ἀπερὶ in the political sense was impossible. His insistence that the Greek passion for independence was not an obstacle but an incentive to federalism and that independence and democracy were closely linked is especially welcome.

University of Manchester

H. D. WESTLAKE

## ROMAN CIVILIZATION

MARTIN VAN DEN BRUWAENE: *La société romaine*. Première partie: *Les origines et la formation*. Pp. 342; 45 ill. Brussels: Les Éditions Universitaires, 1954. Paper, 285 B.fr.

It might have been a little difficult to determine to what class of reader the author was addressing this book, had the publisher's note not supplied an answer: 'est destiné à combler une lacune. Trop de personnes éclairées croient encore que la culture classique est faite d'un mélange gréco-romain et que Rome n'a fait que continuer la Grèce. L'auteur s'est efforcé d'apporter plus d'exactitude dans la confrontation des deux formantes de la culture méditerranéenne. Dans ces "origines" il éclaire de façon nouvelle la qualité spontanée du caractère romain.' He starts by seeking to isolate the specifically Roman gods and the source of the characteristic marks of the Roman religious spirit. He then examines problems of Regal Rome, attempts to discover what reality lies behind many of the legends, discusses relations between patricians and plebeians, studies Rome's natural genius in the formulation of law and the organization of her empire, finds Greek influences in the work of the Gracchi which explain the generosity of their enterprise, and finally devotes a chapter to the Scipionic Circle where Greek and Roman elements harmoniously fused (this last chapter reproduces a brochure entitled *Le Cercle de Scipion Émilien*, published at Brussels in 1937). The work is enlivened by many illustrations (though that of the Palatine Iron Age settlement on p. 97 is too obscure to mean much, to anyone who has not seen the site).

Van den Bruwaene is not shy of speculation and novelty. The Vestal Virgins emerge as war-captives who become hierodules, set apart 'à un culte hiérogamique' (p. 27); the Pontifex is a rain-maker (the 'posse-facere' of Varro, *L.L.* v. 85, becomes by metathesis 'fosse-pacere'; Umbrian *paca* = *causa*; *fosse*, *fos*, *fons*); Janus becomes important as a sky-god when equated with Etruscan *ani*; Jupiter was originally a fountain- or spring-god (*Iu* or *Iov* = water: cf. *Juturna*); the *di novensides* are also water divinities. Despite recent archaeological work, a Terramara settlement is confidently placed on the Palatine (p. 105), corresponding to Roma Quadrata. Tullus Hostilius appears, as in the eyes of Dumézil, as a Celtic warrior, on the basis of the Horatii and Curiatii: *hostis* is of Nordic origin, Tullus may be compared with Tulla in Ireland, the king shows the warrior spirit (Celtic *ferg*; *furor*) and commands the *Celeres* ('les *Celeres* furent attribués par l'annalistique à Romulus, mais il convient de les restituer à Tullus Hostilius', p. 94). Thus van den Bruwaene is led to believe in a Gallic element in prehistoric Rome. In his reconstruction of the mingling of Latins, Etruscans, Sabines, and Gauls in early Rome, he is much concerned with exogamy and endogamy. The plebeians and Latins, who practised endogamy, regarded the patricians as a clan of strangers like the Etruscans: dislike

of exogamy lies behind the stories of Lucretia, Verginia, and the girl from Ardea, women of plebeian origin seized by men from strange clans, i.e. respectively by the Etruscan Tarquin, by the Sabine Appius Claudius, and by nobles allied with strangers. To what extent of speculation van den Bruwaene is willing to go may be seen from his views on the Decemviri (p. 167). Because two of the decemvirs (Appius Claudius and Sp. Veturius) were of Sabine origin, we should look to Sabine territory where we shall find *octoviri*: 'comment dès lors ne pas admettre que le clan sabin de Rome ait voulu, sous la conduite d'Appius, imposer ou faire accepter son système de gouvernement?'; the story of the addition of two laws by the second college of decemviri is improbable, but since tradition recounts the addition of two items, these will then have been two men to the Sabine octoviri! One final example, from the history of coinage. The gold stater issued in Greece c. 196 B.C. by Flaminius (who on one page is three times called Flaminius and once given the *praenomen* P.) is said (p. 223) to have been influenced by the Roman denarius with the head of Philip which belongs either to 105 B.C. (Sydenham, n. 551) or to c. 95 B.C. (Grueber, *Brit. Mus. Cat.*), while the Flaminius gold stater itself, which circulated in Greece and certainly not officially in Italy, is alleged to have had great influence on the development of Roman coinage. Even more fantastic is the suggestion about the animals depicted on the early Aes Signatum: 'le lingot portait . . . un dauphin quand ce lingot équivalait à un droit de pêche'. Did fishing-rights exist in early third-century Italy? (whatever Polybius 6.17.2 means it surely refers to the second century)? Further, by analogy one would have to suppose that the piece that shows an elephant was a permit for big-game hunters!

It should be said that this book is easy to read, even though many of its theories may not be easy to accept. The essay on Scipio Aemilianus is interesting, whether we agree or not with the view that Polybius was ousted by Panaetius in Scipio's friendship; but since the book appears to be directed chiefly to the enlightened general reader, he should be warned that it contains much speculative novelty.

King's College, London

H. H. SCULLARD

### A POCKET FASTI

*Fasti Capitolini*. Recensuit, praefatus est, indicibus instruxit ATILIUS DEGRASSI. (Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum.) Pp. ii + 191. Turin: Paravia, 1954. Paper, L. 800.

THIS 'pocket edition' of the Capitoline *Fasti* is in essentials a severely pruned *editio minor* of the author's monumental *Inscriptiones Italiae* XIII. i. While scholars who concern themselves with problems of Roman history and epigraphy will find in it no substitute for that great work, it provides a working text, with introduction and a few textual notes (also in Latin), for students and others who require no more; and its reasonable price will place it within their financial possibilities.

I.I. XIII. i was published in 1947, and the eulogies on it should find their reflection in any review of this abridged version.<sup>1</sup> Since that date there have appeared several articles on the date of compilation and inscribing of the

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, A. W. Van Buren in *A.J.P.* lxix (1948), 101-5.

*Fasti*, notably by Professor Lily Ross Taylor, and further careful excavation has been carried out by Professor P. Romanelli and others on the site of the Augustan arch in the Roman Forum, on the walls of which the *Fasti* were inscribed. The results of this last have brought about a slight remodelling of Degrassi's views on the arrangement of the *tabulae* of the *Fasti*, which adorned the available walls of the centre arch (that erected after Actium): the *Fasti triumphales* were inscribed on the restored *parastatae* after the renovations and additions of 20/19 B.C. Had it been possible, a diagram of some kind to illustrate the envisaged disposition would have made it much easier for the average reader to follow, and it is for such that the book is presumably intended.

Other recent work on the subject of the *Fasti* has, however, not caused any change in the author's views, nor much concession in his text. The text he prints is in fact from first to last that of *I.I.* xiii. i,<sup>1</sup> although more recent counter-proposals are noted: e.g. he refers in a footnote to the arguments of A. and J. Gordon (*A.J.P.* lxxii [1951]) on the consuls of A.D. 13, but his text remains unaffected and he gives no reasons for discounting them. His version has, incidentally, been recently defended for him.<sup>2</sup>

He devotes some space to the rejection of Professor Taylor's views on the date of composition and inscription, but even so the treatment is summary. Apart from the evidence of the archaeological context newly available, he finds the erasure of the names of the Antonii (which is not found in the *Fasti triumphales*) sufficiently convincing for an immediately post-Actian date. With Tacitean subtlety of verbal usage he leads the reader to assume the heterodoxy of Professor Taylor's views and the orthodoxy of his own: 'cum demonstraverim eos (fastos) prostitisse in arcu Augusto post victoriam Actiacam anno a.C.31 decreto' has now become 'cum constet . . .'. This may well be true, and the general probabilities have convinced the present reviewer of it; but the opposing views are discounted, one feels, more unceremoniously than they deserve.

Apart from the few alterations made in consequence of the articles and excavations referred to, the introduction reproduces in an abridged form that of *I.I.* xiii. i, from which passages are extracted verbatim, and the subjects are arranged similarly. There is one new heading, *De Fastorum origine*, which represents the *Praefatio* of the original. Other inscribed *fasti* are briefly listed (pp. 23-25); in this section several misprints and errors occur, which elsewhere are remarkably few. For example, the *Fasti Collegii sepulchralis urbani* run from 5 B.C. to A.D. 1, although the first consular name for which they provide evidence is that of Calvisius (4 B.C.); the *Fasti Biondiani* give the name of Servilius (*cos.* 41 B.C.), and the note that they begin in 40 may be the result of hasty copying of a misprint in *I.I.* xiii. i, p. 291.

Confusion resulting from the copying of *I.I.* may also arise in the noting of lacunae. For example, in an entry such as the following:

358 [C. Fabius N. f. M. n. Amb]ustus C. Plautius P. f. P. n. Proculus  
Perierunt versus circiter 20

350 [M. Popillius M. f. C. n. Laenas III] [L. Cornelius P. f. —. n. Scipio]

it may easily pass unnoticed that the consular names of 350 themselves form one of the lines that have perished. In such circumstances it would have been

<sup>1</sup> I note that the [*Quaest. exerc. caussa*] of Maenius' dictatorship in 320 is now rightly queried, but no reason is given; cf. T. R. S.

Broughton, *Magistrates*, i. 152.

<sup>2</sup> By J. Suolahti in *Eranos*, li (1953), 146-50.

better to write 'Desunt versus circiter 19', as appears on the right-hand page of *I.I.* from which the text has been derived, and thus preserve the accuracy of the epigraphic transcript.

Nearly half the book is taken up with the indexes, useful and comprehensive; the list of consuls in chronological order is perhaps a luxury, since the *Fasti* themselves have, apart from lacunae, given the same information in the same way, but one would in any case prefer too much indexing to too little.<sup>1</sup>

In the ensemble this book gave me the impression, I hope mistakenly, of having been rather hurriedly put together to fit the requirements of the *Paravia* series. *I.I.* xiii. i has been laid as it were on a bed of Procrustes, and the truncated result seems somehow unsatisfactory. It might have been preferable to regard the venture as something to be undertaken *de novo*, and to produce an illustrated handbook written expressly for the audience whom it is desired to reach, a simplified exposition of the *Fasti* which did not seek at the same time to bring its parent volume into line with the last eight years of learned research. As it is, it does not shine with its own light. But since it so faithfully mirrors the superlative quality of the original work and of the scholarship which produced it, such criticisms as have been suggested might, indeed should, appear trivial.

Corpus Christi College, Cambridge

A. G. WOODHEAD

### PRIVY COUNSELLORS?

J. A. CROOK: *Consilium Principis*. Imperial Councils and Counsellors from Augustus to Diocletian. Pp. xii+198. Cambridge: University Press, 1955. Cloth, 27s. 6d. net.

CINEAS' 'Assembly of Kings' had, like any other human institution, to face a decline and fall. Statesmanship came and went. Mere political manoeuvre followed. In 59 B.C. a start was made with publishing its proceedings, but under Augustus the practice ceased—perhaps because there were so few noteworthy proceedings to describe. Claudius became emperor, and after that the 'kings' had not even the illusion of being kingmakers. Claudius told them to make constructive speeches in debate but by that time, it seems, they had lost the taste for constructive speech-making. In the civil wars of A.D. 69 they were, as a body, frightened and ineffective. Liberty was restored in A.D. 70 and again in A.D. 96. By then the 'kings' were, many of them, efficient and conscientious viceroys, whether in the making or in retirement. But, collectively, in the senate-house at Rome they did nothing important, because they were given nothing important to do. 'Inter quaesturam ac tribunatum plebis atque ipsum etiam tribunatus annum quiete et otio transiit. . . . Idem praeturae tenor et silentium.' Were the periods in which these senators resided in Rome just periods of rest and refreshment, intervals between arduous tours of provincial duty? 'Tranquillitatem atque otium penitus hausit.' Was Agricola the exception? Inside the senate, and outside it too, a great wealth of administrative talent was available. Particularly in the formulation of imperial policy, was it

<sup>1</sup> The list is again that of *I.I.*; no indication is given of points which might be disputed (e.g. the consuls of 220 B.C., for whom

see H. H. Scullard, *Roman Politics* 220-150 B.C., p. 273).

fully employed? That is the interesting and important question which Crook investigates.

At the end of his book is a prosopographical index of 360 *amici* and *comites* of emperors, down to the time of Diocletian, a list as long again as Bang's, which extended to the death of Severus Alexander. It is an interesting list and, for consultation, a useful one. But it is a list which includes, at one extreme, L. Vitellius, 'pietatis immobilis erga principem', the *amicus* of Gaius and Claudius (and, surely, of Tiberius) and Q. Vibius Crispus, *amicus* of Nero, Vitellius, and the Flavians and, at the other extreme, T. Petronius, Nero's 'elegantiae arbiter', Theon, *amicus* of Claudius, 'presumably the Alexandrian literary critic', and C. Matus, *amicus* of Augustus, 'who invented topiary'. Anybody who anywhere in any surviving source has been called an '*amicus*' of an emperor is there. But, despite the near-technical sense of '*amicitia*' in the politics of the late Republic, is this definition, wherever used, rightly treated as if it was an official title? Does it really establish a single category? The Jews need only have said, 'Thou art no longer Caesar's friend', and Pontius Pilate's name would be on the list. As Crook writes (p. 25), 'Amongst the large class of *amici* at any time, there is no rule of thumb for determining those who were of importance in the government of the empire. There were, as at every court, the dilettanti, the wits, the sycophants, and so on; so that merely to have shown that a man was an *amicus* is not to have discovered in him a counsellor of the emperor.'

But it is with the *amici* who were counsellors that Crook's book is primarily concerned and in chapter iii he shows with admirable clarity how the institution derived from the political tradition of the Roman republic on the one hand and from the hierarchy of the Hellenistic courts on the other—those 'friends', for instance, whom in 168 B.C. C. Popillius Laenas so insolently refused to allow Antiochus Epiphanes to consult (Polybius xxix. 27. 4).

When Augustus instituted the *consilium semestre*, he made a most interesting experiment in government. The fact that, except for the emperor and other members of the imperial house, nobody sat on the Council for more than twelve months at a time and few for more than six need not have meant that 'the body was not permanent or expert enough to initiate anything' (p. 11); it was not necessarily a disadvantage that most of its senatorial members were chosen by lot, for it could not be said that the emperor had packed it with his friends. There was admirable opportunity in this Council for constructive discussion of policy and in the fifth Cyrene edict we have the outcome of one at least of its deliberations. The reform of A.D. 13 (Dio 56. 28. 2 f.) which brought it nearer to being a body selected by the Princeps was no improvement and Tiberius on accession changed its character altogether (Suetonius, *Tiberius* 55). So even before his irresponsible departure from Rome for Capri—an event whose lasting consequences were more disastrous than either Tacitus or Crook has cared to emphasize—the new type of *consilium* was doomed. As Crook makes clear, it needed a tactful chairman: an Augustus, not a Tiberius.

So the emperor was left to summon advisers—*consilarii*—or not to summon them, as he chose, for the formulation of policy and for the dispensing of justice; and, as Crook states, it is impossible to make a rigid distinction between political and legal *consilium* (p. 33). Nerva 'did nothing independently of the leading statesmen of the day', if Cassius Dio is to be believed. And, for close-ups of the Council in action, we have the nightmare travesties of Law Reports



which are constituted by the Acts of the Heathen Martyrs, a brilliant satire of Juvenal about a turbot, and the younger Pliny's tedious and no doubt accurate account of the meetings of Trajan's judicial *consilium* and of the trivialities with which it dealt. Recently, in an inscription from Dmeir (see P. Roussel and F. De Visscher, *Syria*, xxiii [1942/3], 173-94) there has been found, from the reign of Caracalla, an inscription which is the only genuine official report of an imperial *cognitio* that exists.

Practice was at first amateurish and informal, compared with what was to come later. Though leading jurists advised emperors in the first century, they did so spasmodically, and it was by an innovation of Hadrian that all the chief legal experts of the time sat regularly on the judicial *consilium*. 'Cum iudicaret, in consilio habuit non amicos suos aut comites solum, sed iuris consultos' (S.H.A., *Hadrian* 18. 1).

Further progress to the fully developed *consistorium* of the third and fourth centuries is best described in Crook's own words:

'In a fully developed bureaucracy, as the later Empire was, the executive controls policy; in a state which is not a bureaucracy, the executive carries out policy decisions made by others. The early Empire was a state of the latter kind; its principal policy-making body, the informal *consilium* of *amici principis*, was largely separate from the executive, and even when the civil service with its bureaux and officials grew up they had at first no connexion with the *consilium*, except in so far as individual officials might be *amici principis*. In the *consistorium* it is the heads of the civil service who are the permanent policy-makers; legislature, judiciary and executive are combined in the same hands, and the executive has won the battle for power. The stages of its progress in this struggle cannot be dated exactly; but even if Hadrian's reign was not a turning-point, the *principes officiorum* were certainly in control by the time of the Severans. The establishment of the *consistorium* is one more sign of Constantine's clear-headed recognition and acceptance of his historical situation' (p. 103).

This is, in some ways, a disappointing book. It shows that in the early empire there were men who could without complete impropriety be called 'privy counsellors' and it identifies many of them. But evidence as to the extent to which individuals other than the Princes himself left their mark on imperial policy simply does not exist. However, this is to criticize the evidence, not the author. Crook has assembled all the evidence that there is and has evaluated it most fairly. His book is interesting as well as useful. Written with enviable clarity, it prompts the hope that its author will write more on, in particular, the second, third, and fourth centuries of the Empire.

Exeter College, Oxford

J. P. V. D. BALSDON

## THE NORTH-EAST FRONTIER OF ITALY

ATTILIO DEGRASSI: *Il confine nord-orientale dell'Italia romana*. Ricerche storico-topografico. (Dissertationes Bernenses, i. 6.) Pp. 10+189; 7 plates, 1 map. Bern: Francke, 1954. Paper, 23.50 Sw.fr.

THE frontier discussed here was, until 42 B.C., the north-eastern frontier of the province of Gallia Cisalpina, and must in fact have coincided originally with that of the territory of Aquileia. Professor Degrassi pictures it being moved forward as Aquileia seems to have expanded across the Timavus into Istria and northwards into the area where, eventually, the territories of Forum Iulium Transpadanorum and Iulium Carnicum were carved out of it. Later, on the

Istrian sector, there were more considerable extensions, first to the Formio, next to the Arsia, and finally so as to include Tarsatica—i.e. effectively to the Fiumara. Farther north the line must have been taken to the crest of the Alps, and in one sector it was ultimately moved beyond this until it included Emona. Some of the details in Degrassi's account might be questioned, but broadly the fact of such changes is accepted. It is over the dates of each and the reasons for them that serious controversy has arisen. Degrassi's account makes it very clear that the evidence does not suffice for more than probable solutions of many of the points at issue—and not always for as much as that. Indeed on some of the cruces he sanely prefers a *non liquet* to the formulation of new hypotheses in place of those that he has shown to be unsatisfactory. On others he has his own convictions which he states fairly, persuasively, and, of course, with great learning and precision in interpretation. His views must carry special weight because he is arguing not only from the literary and epigraphic texts and the archaeological remains, but also from a profound knowledge of the ground, which is his own home territory. Degrassi follows the practice current among Italian topographers in arguing from Medieval city and diocesan boundaries to those of the preceding Roman towns. That caution is desirable in this matter is clear from a recent article by D. A. Bullough, 'The *regnum Italiae* in the Carolingian Period', P.B.S.R. xxiii (1955), 148 ff.

In his account of the major changes he attributes much activity to Caesar in c. 50 B.C. and to the Triumvirs immediately after Philippi, with a corresponding reduction in that allowed to Augustus, either in the Thirties or later. That Caesar should have strengthened the frontier communities after the enemy attacks recorded in 52 B.C. is likely enough: equally so that the Triumvirs should have made changes when Cisalpina ceased to be a province, quite apart from their possible plans for veteran colonies here. But the particulars remain disputable. Thus Degrassi takes Appian, *Illyrica* 18. 52, of 35 B.C., to provide a *terminus ante quem* for the colony at Tergeste—but not everyone will accept Appian at face value: and he suggests that Pietas Iulia is a name only relevant immediately after Philippi—whereas to some it will seem to embody a concept of continuing importance to the relation of Augustus and the armies, something that might be used over a long period of Augustus' life.

Degrassi dates the move to the Formio in 42 B.C., that to the Arsia between 18 and 12 B.C. and probably in c. 16 B.C., and that to the Fiumara, together with the inclusion of Emona, in c. A.D. 170. In discussing reasons for the first two moves he stresses the romanization of the areas concerned and their ethnic unity. These must have been important considerations and will certainly have affected the choice of the new frontiers. But Augustus' other frontier changes tended to be responses to specific barbarian activity; and it might be that these, too, followed such stimuli and were primarily intended to provide Italy with a securer defence against raids. Barbarians were still within striking distance of her here until the firm establishment of Roman control along the Danube. The insubordination of the Carni and Iapydes in 35 B.C. might in fact provide a good alternative context for frontier changes to the events of 42 B.C.: and some insufficiency in the new frontier, indicated when the Pannonians and Noricans raided Istria in c. 16 B.C., at least part of the reason for the new move which Degrassi proposes to date at this time. For the move attributed to Marcus Aurelius he does offer a military reason, regarding the newly included territory as a relic of a temporary defence zone created from the borderlands of Italy,

Upper Pannonia, and Dalmatia—so he interprets the *praetentura Italiae*—whose useful unity it seemed desirable to retain even after the defeat of the Marcomanni; and this is a most attractive argument. After Marcus Aurelius he believes that no further changes were made.

The history of this sector of the Italian frontier is not perhaps an obviously suitable subject for a book. It is peripheral and, given the state of the evidence, in many points hypothetical. But this is worth reading as an example of scholarship. And Degraasi has given it life by his obvious love of the country which he is discussing.

Newnham College, Cambridge

J. M. REYNOLDS

## ROME BEYOND THE IMPERIAL FRONTIERS

R. M. WHEELER: *Rome beyond the Imperial Frontiers*. Pp. xii+192; 38 plates, 19 figs, map. London: Bell, 1954. Cloth, 25s. net.

It could, no doubt, go without saying that this book is an exciting one to read—exciting both in the range of its material (enough of which is also beautiful, and beautifully illustrated), and in its treatment. In his preface, Sir Mortimer denies a partnership of archaeology and drama; in his writing he transmits continually the dramatic quality in objects found and in their finding, but does it without diminishing the prudence of his summing up. For all the excitement, his readers are left well aware of gaps in knowledge preventing sure conclusions, of cautions to be exercised even where evidence may seem abundant.

He offers in effect three separate studies, of three areas well beyond the Roman frontiers to which Roman goods were traded—Germany, Africa, and the Far East, especially India. The material available for these is unequal in quantity; but he gives for each a brief account of such literary evidence as survives (referring to the fuller accounts of M. P. Charlesworth's *Trade Routes and Commerce of the Roman Empire* and E. H. Warmington's *Commerce between the Roman Empire and India*) and discusses the kinds of Roman goods so far found there, in their archaeological context. Inevitably, the chapters on Africa are a mere sketch of possibilities, for there has been little investigation in Africa outside the boundaries of the Roman provinces. The presentation of what is known from Africa is in the nature of a provocation to go and look for more. The German and Far Eastern chapters are the matter of the book, and comprise the results of many excavations published, inconveniently for most of us, in scattered periodicals and a variety of languages. Even for these, however, the account remains incomplete in many respects. In the Far Eastern chapters an important element is, of course, that provided by Sir Mortimer's own discoveries in India.

'This book', so the introduction states, 'is concerned with Roman adventuring beyond the outermost boundaries of the Roman Empire.' The terms are defined in the broadest possible sense. A Roman is anyone 'directly in the service of imperial commerce'; the boundaries are 'the widest imperial limits of the Second Century A.D.'

It must be admitted that, as a rule, the Roman adventurers can only be shadows, dimly imagined behind the goods with which they traded. Indeed as far as personality goes, the men who received the goods sometimes seem to

appear more clearly than the men who sold them. Nevertheless there does emerge a real and important impression of the vigour of industrial production within the empire; and, even when allowance is made for those goods that travelled to their distant findspots as diplomatic gifts, and for more that, at certain periods, went as the loot of barbarian raiders, there does also emerge a view, if only a general one, of real energy and enterprise among the Roman merchants.

The choice of boundaries gives rise to a certain disappointment—which is liable to increase when the reader realizes that he is not to have a complete survey even of all the material found outside these, broadly drawn as they are. This of course is largely gluttony on the reader's part: but perhaps not entirely so. The boundaries chosen lasted in some cases for so short a while; and exclude from discussion so important an area as Parthia, which, after all, was normally an independent power. They were drawn, moreover, in the last stages of the history of Rome's expansion, and therefore exclude from consideration many areas which had by that time been annexed or brought within close range of the frontiers, but had once been remote, and called then for no less daring in the merchants who exploited their markets than eventually did the Baltic, the Fezzan, East Africa, and the Far East. One such area—Britain—Sir Mortimer mentions, with an assurance that its inclusion would have involved tiresome argument; he must forgive his readers for an incredulity borne of the ease with which so many plain sherds and dull buckets have become, in his pages, symbols of adventurous enterprise. Obviously all the possible material could not be fitted into the compass of a manageable book. But it seems not impossible that some of the material omitted might have been relevant to the assessment of the effect of Roman long-range trade upon the purchasers which is attempted in the final chapter.

It is ungrateful, however, to ask for what it was not the author's intention to give, when what he has given is so stimulating. The stimulus in it for the archaeologists—the provocation to explore—has already been noted in reference to the African chapters: it is of course present in every part of the book. In addition, there is the stimulus to the historians—to the historians of all the native cultures in each of the areas that he treats, but above all (what is especially pertinent to readers of this journal) to the historians of the Roman Empire. There are for them many questions which Sir Mortimer himself asks and others which it was not relevant to his purpose to ask. Thus he notes the uncertainties in our knowledge of the formal relations of Rome with the governments in whose territories her merchants traded. He is doubtless right in supposing that in general the private traders were well ahead of the diplomats—setting them in motion later; but a new examination of the scanty evidence on diplomacy in this connexion might yield some new information on imperial foreign policy and commercial conditions in particular. There is also an allied problem. Some parts of the areas treated here—notably Bohemia under Maroboduus and the kingdom of the Garamantes—were client kingdoms of the Empire; and the special character of their relationship with Rome gives a special value to this evidence of her trading with them. Here especially it would be convenient to have some of the omitted evidence, from other client kingdoms. Then it might be possible to consider what value the imperial government put upon this trading as a cement of loyalty, a creator of dependency.

Or, another problem—at first sight it is surprising that in the troubled third century A.D. Roman trade with the Fezzan was, according to present evidence, at its most brisk. Presumably, then, the evidence for the organization of a Tripolitanian *limes* in this century and the construction of three forts in the desert oases to the south of Tripolitania by Septimius Severus reflect less a fear of barbarian invasion of the province than an attempt to police securely the caravan routes to the Fezzan, as R. G. Goodchild recently suggested from an examination of the construction of the forts (*P.B.S.R.* xxii [1954], 56 ff.): and it was a successful attempt, it would appear.

Or again, in the fourth and the early fifth century, when the evidence from India suggests that the volume of Roman imports was declining to an eventual standstill, pepper, which was the major object of the Indian trade, was still filling the *Horrea Piperatica* at Rome. How did it reach them? How was it paid for?

And again, in the extremely interesting final chapter in which Sir Mortimer takes stock of all that he has laid before his readers, he rates very low the effects of this long-range trade on the purchasers. He is thinking in terms of the transmission of ideas; and, with the one exception of the influence of Mediterranean sculpture on Buddhist art in north-west India, the cultural effects seem to him nugatory or transient. He makes a strong case for his view. It was not, of course, part of his purpose to consider other effects. But the economic ones cannot have been inconsiderable; and the reviewer, who is entirely ignorant of oriental archaeology, would wonder whether the Indian societies concerned, owing a prosperity of some duration to the Roman demand for pepper and for silk (since some Indians seem to have been middlemen in the silk trade), did not owe also to it, indirectly, the development and duration of native civilizations; and this in itself, if it were the case, would be surely an important thing, even if we allow that it would be less interesting and less important than the effective fertilization of the ideas of one people by those of another.

There are many more questions that could be asked, and will no doubt be asked, some on major points, some on the incidentals (for instance were the Romans—at any rate Romans on the definition used in this book—such timid sailors?). But however many, they are all a tribute to the stimulating character of the book, which will be valued and enjoyed by general public and by students alike.

Newnham College, Cambridge

J. M. REYNOLDS

## THE ROMAN EMPIRE

ANDRÉ AYMARD, JEANNINE AUBOYER: *Rome et son Empire*. (Histoire Générale des Civilisations, Tome ii.) Pp. 783; 48 plates, 32 maps and plans. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1954. Paper.

THE series to which this volume belongs is conceived on a rather unusual plan. There is no straight narrative, but description and analysis of various aspects of civilization. M. Aymard, who has written all but the section on the Orient, begins with an account of the peoples Rome conquered: the Italians, especially the Etruscans, the Carthaginians, and the Celts, above all in Gaul. Rome's Greek and Eastern subjects obviously come within the scope of the previous

volume, which is by the same authors. Then follows a survey of Roman Republican civilization. Aymard successively examines (1) the causes of Roman expansion and of its success, in particular the army and its development; (2) political institutions and the breakdown of the Republic; (3) economic and social evolution; (4) the native Roman religion and the introduction of Greek and Eastern practices; (5) Roman art, literature, etc. and the impact of Hellenism. This arrangement is not altogether happy; full understanding of the breakdown of the Republic depends in part on knowledge of social developments, which Aymard comes to later. In the long period of 700 years conditions changed so much that it might perhaps have been better if the various aspects of Republican history had not been examined from end to end in separate compartments, but in their mutual relations at different stages. The more static conditions of the first two centuries of the Empire make its similar treatment more successful, and in the last part Aymard is wise to devote a chapter to the transitional period of the third century before systematically describing civilization in the fourth and fifth. At the end Mlle Auboyer contributes an account of Persia, India, China, etc. in the first four centuries A.D. (pp. 603-700); the authors admit that the relation of this section to what goes before is largely no more than that of synchronism. A very brief chronological table is appended, hardly adequate for readers who do not already know the outlines of Roman (or Oriental) history, and for them perhaps redundant. The photographs are admirable.

The work has no notes, and it is plainly addressed primarily to the general reader and to less advanced students; it must be presumed that the authors expect it to complement a more orthodox textbook. What does it offer such readers? The style is sober and clear, but one may feel the lack of the telling phrase and the illustrative detail that give life and colour; the treatment will hardly evoke enthusiasm for Roman studies. On the other hand, for those who already know something and wish to know more, Aymard has written a valuable work. The range and exactness of his scholarship few could equal. He picks his way adroitly through controversial ground. In interpretation he has no new axe to grind but presents a judicious synthesis, bringing out points too often neglected, such as Rome's debt in government to Hellenistic states and the misery of the masses under the Empire, but almost too cautious in final judgement. He has many penetrating things to say of the interrelation of different human activities, political, economic, religious, etc. I know of no more balanced picture of the early Empire. Scholars will read the book with profit, and it is a pity that no comparable work exists in English for a larger public.

In a short review it is impossible to take up effectively points of general interpretation; that would almost require a rival work. Nor can I list all detailed statements from which I should dissent; inevitably Aymard commits himself to propositions which could be doubted and which he has no space to justify. Closer consideration of a short section (pp. 247-63) in which Aymard discusses the preservation of the *Pax Augusta* will perhaps serve to illustrate some features of the book.

First, its accuracy. Some of the few errors occur here. Army pay was not raised by Augustus, and it is at least misleading to describe the soldier as 'bien équipé et ravitaillé par l'intendance' (261; see *P.B.S.R.* 1950, pp. 50 ff.). *Peregrini* were recruited in the legions even in the first century A.D. (e.g. *I.L.S.* 2483, *contra* p. 257). It is misleading to say that the armies were stationed on



the frontiers, without indicating that this was the outcome of a very gradual process (p. 250). The statement (p. 253) that the army was composed only of volunteers goes beyond even Arrius Menander (*Dig.* xlix. 16. 4. 10): 'plerumque voluntario milite numeri suppleuntur', and even that may only be true after Severan increases in pay; apart from times of crisis, Suet. *Tib.* 8 attests conscription in Italy c. 23 B.C. and Tac. *Ann.* iv. 4. 2 and Vell. ii. 130 might suggest that it was abandoned there only under Tiberius—hence, perhaps, the gradual diminution of Italians in the legions. Elsewhere it was retained at least for a time, cf. Suet. *Gaius* 43; Tac. *Ann.* iv. 46; *Hist.* iv. 14; Front. *de controu. agrorum* p. 53; Plin. *ad Trai.* x. 29–30; *Dig.* xlix. 16. 4. 11–12 (rescript of Trajan); l. 4. 18. 3(?). We just do not know when or how far it was ever given up.

Here Aymard has only exaggerated an orthodox mistake, and in some points of interpretation he has perhaps been misled by common opinion. Thus, after underrating the great extension of Roman territory by Augustus (249), he limits his aims for expansion to the Elbe (p. 251). This is modern conjecture; no text asserts it. To say nothing of the poets and Augustus' admiration for Alexander (Suet. *Aug.* 18; 50; 94, 5), his avowal that he and his successors should emulate those who 'fines imperii propagaverunt' (*ibid.* 31. 5 with Cic. *De Rep.* iii. 24) should give us pause. He could not use our maps, and Agrippa's commentaries, if the reconstruction of Klotz (*Klio*, 1931) is sound, gave the whole land-mass from Rhine to 'Chinese sea' as only about three times the extent of Gallia Comata. Hadrianic concern with defence must not be retrojected; as Aymard sees, Rome never abjured wars of aggression—world-rule was for Virgil an *ideal*—but he may be wrong in assuming that they were in ultimate intention for defence. Again (251) Aymard finds economic motives for Claudius' and Trajan's wars. But one thinks of Claudius' 'gloria prolati imperi ultra Oceanum' and Dio's verdict on Trajan. In all ancient thought (save for some philosophers) the pursuit of glory was proper and rational; among countless subjects of Rome *φιλοτιμία* assumed the most uneconomic forms. Silence of ancient sources on commercial factors in policy may too readily be taken for naïveté. On p. 256 Aymard suggests that the Roman standing army was small. By modern standards, yes; hardly by Hellenistic (cf. Bickerman, *Institutions des Séleucides*, p. 55) or those of the Republic in normal times (Frank, *Ec. Survey*, i. 222–4). Parthia had no such army. The third-century crisis hardly shows that it was inadequate, if it had been loyal and disciplined. To the primitive economy of the empire it was a grievous burden, as Aymard notes. Shortage of money as of men probably forced Augustus in A.D. 9 to abandon Germany and all further schemes of expansion.

One other more orthodox criticism might be made: on p. 260 Aymard gives the impression that frontier works were more useful against large invasion than they were perhaps even designed to be. But in general his picture is sound. He is right to preface the description of imperial civilization by dwelling on the *Pax Augusta*, on which all else depended, to trace its establishment first to 'lassitude' and then to growing acceptance of Roman ideals, and to describe fully the organization of the army, the essential instrument of peace for the time, as formerly it had been the ruin of the Republic and was yet to be the ruin of the Principate. He does not forget its role in romanization, nor the chance it gave men to rise by merit in the social order; nor again the lack of solidarity between the soldiers and the civilians they were meant to protect. (This was not only true of soldiers who came from frontier regions, as p. 262 might suggest; one

thinks of Vitellius' Italians.) But he does not note how the classes who cared for and understood Rome's mission were increasingly ready to serve Rome with their lips, but not their lives, and failed to provide loyal officers who might have kept the peasant soldiery in hand. Explanation would take us far afield. I feel that Aymard has missed the profound significance of Tacitus' story: the 'sapientissimus et unus' decides; for the rest 'inscitia rei publicae ut alienae'; hence 'subit . . . ipsius inertiae dulcedo'. But with all reservations—and Aymard is more at home in other chapters—this is an admirable survey.

Oriel College, Oxford

P. A. BRUNT

## BYZANTINE STUDIES

NORMAN H. BAYNES: *Byzantine Studies and Other Essays*. Pp. xi+392. London: Athlone Press, 1955. Cloth, 35s. net.

It is a matter of sorrow for students of Byzantine history that Professor Baynes with his incomparable learning and understanding of Byzantium should have published so little to enlighten them. The great Social History of Byzantium, to which we all looked forward, has never appeared; and it is only in various lectures, articles, and reviews that he has in recent years given us the fruits of his erudition. The present volume, in which its editors have collected those that seemed to them of more general interest, is therefore very welcome, especially as two of the lectures that are included have not been published before.

The first four lectures, 'The Hellenistic Civilization and East Rome', 'The Thought-World of East Rome', 'The Byzantine State', and 'Some Aspects of Byzantine Civilization', deal complementarily with the background to Byzantine civilization, and its development. Baynes has always been opposed to the idea, of which Diehl was the best-known advocate, of Byzantium as an oriental state, growing more and more oriental. He makes use of the name 'East Rome', stressing the Roman aspect, and he shows emphatically the continuity of Hellenic and Hellenistic traditions in Byzantium. The Byzantine was always consciously the Greek and the rest of the world was Barbarian; he could never sink into orientalism. At the same time Baynes is particularly interested in the various dualities that he sees in Byzantine life, between the Hellenic and the Hellenistic traditions, between the Aristotelianism of Orthodoxy and the Platonic speculations of many of the Orthodox, between Basilian monasticism with its emphasis on obedience and works and the mystic contemplation of the hermit-saints, between the general intellectualism of the official world and the simple faith of humble folk. Unlike many historians, he never forgets the humble folk nor the value as historical documents of the popular Lives of the Saints.

There is a lecture on the decline of Roman power in the West, in which Baynes discusses various elaborate modern theories and comes to the simple and convincing conclusion that it was due to the absence in the West of any secure source of men and revenue such as Asia Minor provided. A lecture on Alexandria and Constantinople gives a lucid account of the ecclesiastical diplomacy that brought about the triumph and defeat of the great Egyptian patriarchate in the fourth and fifth centuries. The final lecture, hitherto unpublished, on 'Idolatry and the Early Church', is not only important for the light it throws on the history of Early Christian art, minimizing its oriental

basis and incidentally showing the dangers that beset art-historians who ignore literary sources, but is also an invaluable introduction to the history of Iconoclasm, making the point that both sides in the controversy used pre-Christian arguments to support their views. It should be read in connexion with the shorter article on 'The Icons before Iconoclasm', printed later in the volume.

The articles and reviews that follow deal with more specific and detailed subjects, some of them containing minute technical arguments on dating or on textual criticism, but all of them bring in matters of wider interest, and one of the articles, on St. Augustine's *City of God*, for which Baynes claims no originality, is an extraordinarily clear and useful summary of Augustine's political ideas. The final essay in the book is Baynes's valedictory address to the members of University College, London. It is a moving testimony paid by a liberal to the liberal tradition that a University should enshrine.

The whole volume is so rich in ideas as well as in its elucidation of facts that a short review cannot do it justice. Occasionally the reader may feel some disagreement, though he disagrees at his peril. Few of Baynes's statements are not supported by an impeccable reference. It is possible that his verdict on the relations between Emperor and Patriarch, as given in his lecture on the Byzantine State, needs some qualification. In his determination to show the dangers of a facile belief in the existence of Byzantine 'Caesaropapism', he perhaps goes too far in belittling the priestly attributes of the Emperor. It is true that the canonists did not speak of the Emperor as a priest till the closing centuries of Byzantium; but Leo the Isaurian's claim to be priest as well as Emperor cannot just have been a wild remark made in a bad temper. The Emperor certainly never was priest to the extent of being able to administer the sacraments, yet it seems to have been held that the Emperor had some sort of vague mystical authority over the whole Oecumene, including the Church. The law might carefully separate Church and State; but the Emperor did in fact control the Church through the Patriarch, whom he appointed and deposed at his will, only paying the most superficial attention to the form of election; and it was only when he threatened to outrage the deep religious or moral feelings of the people that the Church could defeat him. They might try to refuse to perform the coronation-ceremony; but surely the importance of the coronation-ceremony, even before unction was introduced, was largely that it seemed to give the Emperor a more than merely secular authority. Nevertheless Baynes's caution about Caesaropapism is valuable, for the West has since the middle ages made the mistake of believing in its existence. One of the difficulties over union between the Churches was the Popes' inability to understand that the Emperors could not order their Church to toe the line; while, on the other hand, the Byzantines were horrified at the idea of a Church that meddled in secular affairs.

Baynes draws a contrast between Hellenic and Hellenistic influences on Byzantium. This is the one place where I find his arguments unclear; for, after saying that the former influence was dominant when the Empire was strong, he goes on to show that it was never more dominant than in the last days of the dying Empire, when the names of Hellas and Hellene appear to describe the Empire and its people. It is true that in the great days that followed the end of Iconoclasm there was a revival of taste for Classicism, in art as well as in literature; but the conscious Hellenism of the last years of the Empire was surely due to a realistic abandonment of the old oecumenical idea of the

Empire and a clinging to the one asset left to the Byzantines, their unbroken Greek tradition.

These are minor queries to which one would like Baynes to give an authoritative answer. For the only real criticism of this volume is that it does not contain more of his work. As it is, its contents are so full of wisdom and of stimulating ideas and clear thinking that every student of Byzantine history will read it with profit and with pleasure.

STEVEN RUNCIMAN

## A COMPANION TO CLASSICAL READING

MOSES HADAS: *Ancilla to Classical Reading*. Pp. xiii+397. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1954. Cloth, 38s. net.

PROFESSOR HADAS, who has recently written histories of Greek and Roman literature, has now provided a companion volume to these. It is written with the same enthusiasm and in the same lively style as his two earlier books, and like them it shows the breadth of the writer's interests and his familiarity with a widely divergent range of subjects. Matters relating to Greek writers are dealt with at very much greater length than those relating to Roman writers, but the bulk of the information, much of which is given in the form of translated quotations, comes from sources of the Roman world.

The book is divided into two parts. The first, entitled 'Production, Reception, and Preservation', deals with the manner in which classical literature was committed to writing and made available to the public, the nature of the criticism it engendered in the ancient world, and its treatment by scholars and others in later ages. In his treatment of these themes Hadas is both entertaining and instructive, but some chapters are unduly compressed, and considerably more space could have been allotted with profit to this part of the book. Generalizing statements are inevitable, but some of those made will not bear close examination. The assertion (p. 27) that only in Egypt does the climate permit the survival of papyrus disregards the important discoveries in Dura-Europos, Herculaneum, and elsewhere. The contention (p. 37) that 'where Roman poetry is not frivolous it is consciously and austere devoted to the service of the Roman ideal' is far from being universally applicable.

In the chapter which surveys the development of scholarship from the Sophists to modern times Hadas attempts to achieve far too much in a short space, and general trends tend to be obscured by a mass of detail. His accounts of ancient scholars read like entries in a classical dictionary rather than integral parts of a whole. His treatment of more recent scholars is bewilderingly succinct, being generally confined to a single sentence which gives a name, a date, and a few words of miscellaneous information. The portrait of Porson may serve as an illustration: 'The greatest name in English scholarship after Bentley is Richard Porson (1759-1808), who combined critical genius with a somewhat rowdy way of life, and was the first to decipher the Greek text of the Rosetta Stone.'

The first part of the book, although open to criticism, provides much interesting information which is likely to enhance appreciation and understanding

of classical literature, particularly Greek literature. It is doubtful if the same can be said of the second part which occupies the greater part of the book. This is entitled 'Literary Gossip', and attempts to supplement the information usually given in histories of literature by quoting and discussing the comments of ancient writers on the great literary figures of the Greek and Roman world and their writings. Hadas warns his readers that this information may not always be reliable and is often trivial, but he claims that it helps to bring the authors under discussion to life and adds to one's understanding of their works. It is difficult to believe that this is so. Much of this ancient commentary seems gross caricature in which the lineaments of the originals are barely discernible. It may be interesting to the student of ancient literary criticism, but can only bewilder and mislead the inexperienced reader for whom it is intended.

Hadas realizes this danger and tries to avoid misconception of the passages quoted by judicious caveats. He explains and enlivens the quotations by comments of his own. His guidance is, however, not always reliable and some of his statements are startling in their inaccuracy. One gathers (p. 266) that Antiphon's only extant speeches are the *Tetralogies*, which are 'probably hypothetical'. A statement made by the Platonic Socrates (*Phaedrus* 242 b) about Phaedrus is taken to refer to Lysias (p. 267). Isocrates' school is said (p. 269) to have 'trained virtually all the public men of the generation following his maturity' (on the following page we are told that Demosthenes was not one of his pupils). It is stated (p. 285) that no speeches of Dinarchus or Lycurgus 'have come down in manuscript tradition'. It is not easy to see what is meant by the 'genuineness' of the longer Homeric Hymns (p. 148); the reader might reasonably infer that their author was Homer.

The selection of material sometimes seems ill-judged. We are told, for instance, about Demosthenes' alleged transactions with Lais of Corinth, but there is no mention of his connexion with the Harpalus scandal which provides such a prominent theme in the extant speeches of his contemporaries. There is a good deal of unnecessary repetition in the book. The effect of Gorgias' visit to Athens is mentioned on p. 43 and p. 262 (but different dates are given); the story about Polus, the actor, is told on p. 57 and p. 189; similar statements about Zenodotus are made on p. 91 and p. 143; the remark ascribed by Aristotle to Sophocles is quoted on p. 187 and p. 193.

The volume concludes with bibliographical notes and a full index which gives dates and a brief description of the persons concerned as well as page references. Judgements will probably vary as to the value of this book. In the opinion of the reviewer its purpose would have been better served if the first part had been expanded to twice its present length and the second part drastically curtailed.

King's College, Newcastle upon Tyne,  
University of Durham

H. LL. HUDSON-WILLIAMS

# SHORT REVIEWS

WALTER F. OTTO (trans. MOSES HADAS): *The Homeric Gods: the spiritual significance of Greek religion*. Pp. viii+310. London: Thames & Hudson, 1955. Cloth, 21s. net.

THE translator is of opinion that Otto's work has the right approach, that its soundness has been unshaken by later research, and that it is 'the most luminous treatment for the non-professional reader' (p. vii). His translation for the most part reads smoothly enough, but has defects in detail, beginning with the title, which in German is *Die Götter Griechenlands: das Bild des Göttlichen im Spiegel des griechischen Geistes*, a much more intelligible description of a work which by no means confines itself to Homer, although he bulks large in it, and has at least as much to say concerning Greek mentality as the 'spiritual significance' of anything. Presumably 'persecutors' for 'prosecutors' on p. 19 is a printer's error, but 'primitive civilisations' (p. 22) is a contradiction in terms (doubtless Otto meant early cultures), 'by might and main' (p. 105) is not English, 'posed' for 'put', on p. 127, is a journalistic Gallicism ('pose a question' = *poser une question*), 'lucidity' on p. 161, line 5 from below, apparently means splendour or radiance, 'deceived him of his victory' (p. 199) means nothing, *Claudianus* (p. 292 n. 45) is Claudian in English when the poet is meant, and worst of all, p. 12 offers the horrible no-word 'societal' and the unpleasing 'rigidified'. The printers have done their work well, in clear type on good paper, but have crammed all the references on to the concluding pages, ingeniously arranging them so as to cause the maximum of inconvenience to anyone consulting them.

Whether the book was worth translating is a matter on which opinions may differ. For myself, I find that a work, admittedly containing some good ideas here and there, which has so large a proportion of mere windy rhetoric and so many statements either certainly wrong or very doubtful (I have noted about thirty) is but ill suited for the kind of reader the translator has chiefly in view.

H. J. ROSE

P. AURELIANUS, O.F.M.Cap. (A. L. J. RAESSENS): *De Verhouding van Godsdiens en Ethiek in Homerus*. Pp. xiv+

120. Nijmegen: Centrale Drukkerij, 1955. Paper.

THIS is a doctoral dissertation presented to the Catholic University of Nijmegen. In it Fr. Aurelianus sets himself to combat the beliefs that 'Homer's gods . . . were essentially devoid of any ethical quality whatsoever' and that 'the ethics of the world of Odysseus were man-made and man-sanctioned' (I take both quotations from Dr. M. I. Finley's valuable *The World of Odysseus* [New York, 1954], p. 149). Of the seven chapters into which Fr. Aurelianus's work is divided, the first (pp. 1-7), which is devoted to the problem of definitions ('What do we mean by "religion" and "ethics"?' and 'Can we speak of "religion" and "ethics" in Homer?'), and the second (pp. 8-24), which contains a most valuable summary of previous views on this question (more than fifty works published between 1878 and 1952 are examined), are essentially introductory; and the conclusion which emerges from them is that the question is essentially *res integra*, and that current opinions about it are little better than superstitions. Fr. Aurelianus's own examination of the question begins in his third chapter (pp. 25-51) with a discussion of thirteen points at which religion and ethics can be shown to impinge upon one another, and of what Homer (for this purpose he treats the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as unities) has to tell us about these points. The fourth chapter (pp. 52-70) deals with Homeric religion, which is found to contain many inconsistencies; these Fr. Aurelianus proposes to explain partly as the products of the evolution from which the poems themselves result, and partly by distinguishing religion proper from mythology. In the fifth chapter (pp. 71-89), on Homeric ethics, Fr. Aurelianus seeks to show that the heroes' actions are influenced not only by a sense of personal honour and respect for public opinion, but also by regard for the justice of the gods, for conscience, and for moral duty. The sixth chapter (pp. 90-104) is devoted to the problem of suffering, and the last chapter (pp. 105-13) is a general summary, the main conclusion of which is that there are sufficient reasons for holding that Homeric man was influenced in his actions by his respect for, and worship of, the gods; and that it is therefore wrong to regard Homeric religion and ethics as entirely separate from one another. An excellent bibliography (pp. ix-xiii) precedes, and



a useful Latin summary (pp. 115-16) follows, the Dutch text; the index is limited to Homeric passages cited.

This is a very thorough, and in general convincing, study of an important subject; and Fr. Aurelianus deserves our gratitude for not allowing the almost unanimous voice of authority to deter him from examining it afresh.

J. A. DAVISON

University of Leeds

Sofocle: *Le Trachiniae*. Con introduzione e commento a cura di G. SCHIASSI. Pp. lix+210. Florence: 'La Nuova Italia', 1953. Paper, L. 900.

ITALIAN youth is fortunate in the number of modern editions of the classics at its disposal. Dr. Schiassi's *Trachiniae* contains a commentary on a generous scale, a good deal longer than the abridged Jebb. This is partly because it supplies the needs of a wider range of student, including beginners at tragedy who need help over simple elisions and the ordinary rules of the trimeter. The commentary is generally sound and sensible; it contains less in the way of syntactical parallels than the older editions but frequently cites and compares translations given by other scholars and in Italian versions of the play. Schiassi is especially anxious to bring out and define the meaning of words, and in consequence he is apt to commit himself to generalizations which are over-bold. *Λόγος* is always founded on something in real life, while *μῦθος* is fictitious; Deianeira is denied the deeper joy, *τέρπεισθαι*, and has only the momentary pleasure denoted by *χαίρειν* (291); in tragic language *πορεύεσθαι* always suggests movement under compulsion; it is not true that Attic poets use *βροτός* only in the plural; when Deianeira goes away to kill herself her gait might be indicated in a stage direction as a *movimento febbrile*, but it is hazardous to maintain that all this is in the *ἀπό* of *ἀφέρπειν*; and though Sophocles' addiction to the Middle Voice is rightly noted, some of the efforts to find in it ethical or emotional profundity are misplaced.

The Introduction contains, in addition to a lively appreciation of the play, an account of the Heracles legend which some students will find rather long. There is a tendency here to simplify by stating as fact what is only conjecture, not least that Heracles was a god before he was a hero; and many of Zielinski's brilliant speculations are given too unrestrained a welcome. The final sec-

tion on the language and style of Sophocles will be useful to beginners, but it is misleading to emphasize his use of Aeolic terminations in Aorist Optative as though it were not the normal Attic practice.

D. W. LUCAS

King's College, Cambridge

C. PRATO: *Euripide nella critica di Aristofane*. Pp. 126. Galatina: Amici del Libro, 1955. Paper, L. 900.

THIS book consists of an introduction on the general character of Aristophanic Comedy, a chapter entitled 'Aristofane ed Euripide', separate chapters on *Ach.*, *Thesm.*, and *Frogs*, and an appendix listing 'Parodie e allusioni Euripidee'.

Prato sees Aristophanes as essentially an 'artist', not the advocate of any opinions. He is right to deny that Aristophanes 'fece della politica lo scopo della sua vita'; but he neglects the fact that 'Aristophanes took many an opportunity to introduce opinions . . . of his own in jest and earnest' (Gomme, *C.R.* lii [1938], 107). He argues as if the motives behind the fantastic schemes of Dicaeopolis and Lysistrata were no more serious than the schemes themselves, and discounts the criticisms of Euripides. But in fact even the foolery of the *ληκύθειον* episode probably embodies a real criticism (Denniston apud Murray, *Aristophanes*, p. 124 n.); and the charges brought directly against Euripides are surely unambiguous, e.g. *Frogs* 849-50; that the parties to Euripides' γάμοι ἀνόσιοι often come to a bad end is irrelevant: Aristophanes knew that such disagreeable subjects inevitably make disagreeable plays. On religion, however, we find an important exception to Prato's general view. Aristophanes, we gather (p. 33), was engaged in a *ἱερὸς πόλεμος* against the Olympians, as is shown by, for example, *Birds* and (of individual passages) *Plut.* 87 ff.: here Aristophanes is a poet of ideas, and Euripides his staunch ally.

To support his view of Aristophanes as an 'artist' Prato argues from events in a way that seems unlikely to win general acceptance. Thus (p. 16) Lamachus' career was not ended by *Ach.* nor Cleon's by *Knights*; therefore Aristophanes' attacks were merely 'artistic', i.e. were not intended. There are other examples of dubious deductions: on p. 22 Prato speaks as if *E.Nub.* 96 settled the question of Aristophanes' attitude to Socrates; on p. 60 we are told that for 'il

cavalleresco Omero' οὐκ αἰνότερον καὶ κύντερον ἄλλο γυναικός—is it not relevant that these words are spoken by Agamemnon's ghost? Sometimes we find a simple muddle, as on p. 25 n. 1, where we are informed that *Ach.* 86 parodies Hdt. i. 33 [*sic*], when what in fact has happened is that R $\Phi$  read the unmetrical ὁπτούς for ὅλους through a memory of Hdt. i. 133. 1. Sometimes, too, important evidence is neglected; for instance, even a short discussion of the portrait of Socrates in *Clouds* should, especially if it claims to justify a particular interpretation, mention the allusion to the play at *Apol.* 19 c and Socrates' account of his early cosmological interests at *Phaedo* 97 a 6 ff.

The appendix of 'Parodie c allusioni Euripidee' contains useful material, but falls between [two stools. It mentions many para-tragic passages which cannot be traced to Euripides, but it is not a full index to para-tragedy in Aristophanes. The Greek quotations in it are very carelessly printed.

The final verdict on this book must be that it lacks the distinction which would justify a new discussion of such well-worn subjects.

D. MERVYN JONES

Exeter College, Oxford

DUDLEY FITTS: *Lysistrata* of Aristophanes. An English version. Pp. xv+132. London: Faber, 1955. Cloth, 12s. 6d.

FITTS's solution of the first problem confronting the translator of a Greek play, the choice of a medium for the dialogue, is 'a very free five-stress line, highly counterpointed, admitting all kinds of variation and distortion'. Apart from the question of what 'counterpointed' means (it should mean that two or more lines are spoken simultaneously) and allowing for the studiously flippant tone of much of the preface, from which the above quotation is taken, this sounds an unpromising equivalent for such a subtly disciplined metre as the Greek (even the comic) iambic trimeter. In fact, the result seems to the present reviewer (though tastes differ) to be, for all practical purposes, prose. Naturally Fitts loses the expressiveness of the changes of rhythm, e.g. the tragic rhythm of 706 ff. and 1124 ff. More successful are the lyrics, to which rhyme is admitted, though the metre remains very free; but they are sometimes marred by ostentatiously bad rhymes to which there is no corresponding prank in the original, e.g. at 262.

In diction Fitts's intention was 'first and

foremost, to be *sayable*' (his italics): and the translation is neat and lively, though it does not rise to nobility of utterance with the original. He shows much acuteness in making Aristophanes' vulgarity palatable to the modern reader without simple excision; but he commits some depressing lapses in taste by translating into vulgar language passages where it is most conspicuously absent from the original (e.g. the famous passage at 595), by inserting vulgarities to which nothing in the original corresponds (e.g. 265), and by tasteless expansion of simple phrases (e.g. 635).

Fitts often takes great liberties with the original: he suppresses whole clauses (e.g. 251 ἐὰν μὴ κτλ.), substitutes phrases of his own for what Aristophanes says (e.g. 243, 1132), suppresses (e.g. 62 πρώτας) or cheapens (e.g. 99 ποθεῖτε) significant words. Occasionally he seems to miss the point of a whole passage (e.g. 37-38) and there are inaccuracies in detail (e.g. 51).

The play is divided into 'scenes' and 'choral episodes' in a way that suggests ignorance of the peculiar structure of Old Comedy, and throughout Fitts says 'choragos' when he means 'coryphaeus'. The book ends with notes and an index of proper names.

A few proper names are misprinted.

D. MERVYN JONES

Exeter College, Oxford

ELFRIEDE HUBER-ABRAHAMOWICZ: *Das Problem der Kunst bei Platon*. Pp. vii+64. Winterthur, Switzerland: P. G. Keller, 1954. Paper.

THE purpose of this monograph is to interpret what Plato says about art, and in particular to elucidate how his remarks on this subject are related to his general view of reality and of man. In a small compass Dr. Huber-Abrahamowicz succeeds in raising and discussing many central problems about Plato's attitude to art and the grounds of his distrust of it. She refers generously to evidence from the dialogues, although detailed study of individual passages is not her chief concern. Her approach is systematic rather than chronological, and she takes for granted that the theory of Ideas was the permanent foundation of Plato's philosophy.

After expounding the parallel which Plato draws between art and sophistic (in both, though in different ways, mere appearance is taken to be an experience of reality) the

writer argues, from *Phaedrus* 250 b, d, that for Plato beauty is essentially just the revelation of reality (*Prinzip des Offenbarseins überhaupt*): only the Ideas are beautiful in the highest degree because they alone are, so to speak, transparent—self-revealing reality. Appearances, whether ordinary things of this world or artistic representations of such things, share in beauty to various degrees according as they succeed in suggesting, pointing to, or embodying Forms. The *Symposium*, in Diotima's speech, traces the stages of a journey from the feeblest manifestations of a Form to the pure Form itself.

She next analyses the nature of art in its relation both to objective reality and to the soul of the artist or art-lover. In its representative aspect a work of art is beautiful in so far as it reveals reality, in so far as it adequately represents things, people, and events which themselves perspicuously embody Forms. In its expressive aspect a work of art is beautiful when it is the expression of a good soul. It is not the realistic drawing of beds that Plato fundamentally demands of art; it is the expression of insight into the nature of God and of man, into the purpose and principles of life: and all this depends on the Forms.

Finally she discusses the dangers Plato saw in art. A man enjoys art which corresponds to desires and attitudes of his own. So the bad man enjoys art which is not really beautiful (not an expression or representation of reality, the Forms); and the good man's taste is the criterion of good art. But even the good man has bad desires. Normally suppressed, they sometimes come out in dreams. The danger of art is that if a man does not take it seriously, but regards it as a harmless source of enjoyment, his bad desires may be strengthened. It is as if he voluntarily puts himself to sleep and lets his unconscious, where his vicious desires lurk, take control. This is the danger in mimesis of what is bad. There is also danger in mimesis as such. It is after all not the real thing; a man should live a grown-up, active, waking life, not relapse into nursery make-believe. She ends with a few words on Plato's suggestions for overcoming these shortcomings and perils, whether by encouraging seriously intended philosophical art (the dialogues) or by integrating art into cult.

These remarks are designed merely to show the general direction of the discussion. The book contains many perceptive judgements and suggestive ideas, and it is well worth reading.

J. L. ACKRILL

Brasenose College, Oxford

EINO MIKKOLA: *Isokrates: seine Anschauungen im Lichte seiner Schriften*. (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, ser. B, tom. 89.) Pp. 347. Helsinki: Finnish Academy, 1954. Paper.

HERE is yet another description of Isocrates' attitude towards such matters as society, education, life, and truth. Mikkola adopts an unusually high opinion of Isocrates' reflective powers: an 'independent logical thinker', he never composed save when he had something important to say in order to meet contemporary needs. Mikkola tries to bring even the 'forensic' speeches under this account: they were purely literary productions, meant not for the law courts but to convey large ideas to a wide public. Thus it is contended that Isocrates was never a logographer; and, though the case is not made out, this theory has some advantages over Mathieu's explanation of *Antid.* 49, that Isocrates had himself forgotten his logographic period, or Norlin's suggestion (*Loeb*, i, p. xx) that he wanted everyone else to forget it.

Mikkola strikes a somewhat novel line in drawing deductions from Isocrates' vocabulary. His fondness for the prefix *συν* derives from his social doctrine of mutual service, which is thought to reconcile his more democratic utterances with his version of the *Führerprinzip*. Similarly his addiction to verbs of thinking ('I think you ought to think', etc.) is attributed not to mock-modesty (still less to self-complacency) but to the caution and reserve natural to one who deliberately rejected the possibility of absolute knowledge. This 'Wahrscheinlichkeitsmodalität' is considered to be of a piece with his relativism (everyone has his own truth), subjectivism (there are no 'values' outside the mind of the valuer), pragmatism, and legal positivism (there is no law other than positive law). The last-mentioned point explains why Mikkola and other sympathizers with the 'positivistic' view of law have been almost bound to misunderstand Plato, and to give a tendentious account of *Rep.* and *Laws*. Hence Mikkola fails to see the weakness of the 'intuitionist' and 'anti-intellectualist' position, which he assigns to Isocrates as an achievement of considerable profundity; nor does he understand that there is no fundamental difference between the 'radical' scepticism of Gorgias and the modified scepticism or probabilism which he claims for Isocrates. His lexical method has its dangers: the common *προσέχειν τὸν νοῦν* is

offered as an example of Isocrates' distinctively 'dynamic' manner of speaking and thinking, and his almost modern and 'functional' view of knowledge. And again on the basis of popular expressions not confined to Isocrates he builds up an explicit belief in an 'ego' as a third factor distinct from soul and body.

Isocrates assumed that there would always exist a conventional morality which he himself neither criticized nor supported. It seems a mistake to attempt to erect into grandiose dogmas the compilations of commonplaces and second-hand ideas which constitute his 'philosophy'. Comparisons with numerous thinkers from Heraclitus to Ortega y Gasset do not seem to make the case any more convincing. Mikkola finds himself compelled to reject the *Ad Dem.* as spurious on the curious ground that its scheme of values differs (but not much, if at all) from that of the genuine Isocrates, who nevertheless (we have been told) had on principle no fixed values or objective standards. I have noted some mistranslations (e.g. p. 187: *eine schlechte Sache* for 'the weaker cause'), but they do not affect the main issues.

J. TATE

University of Sheffield

FRIEDRICH ZUCKER: *Isocrates' Panathenaikos*. Pp. 30. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1954. Paper, DM. 1.50.

This address to the Saxon Academy of Sciences at Leipzig summarizes Isocrates' discourse in praise of Athens, and seeks to relate it to the political situation of the period. Zucker holds, against von Arnim, that there is no mere academic exercise meant for the instruction of Isocrates' pupils, and, in particular, no exposition of a new technique of *ἀμφιβολία* in the differing tone of the judgements passed on Sparta. He succeeds at least in showing that current affairs had a negative influence on the work: Thebes has to be treated with some tenderness; Sparta, as an enemy of Philip, need not be spared, though the futility of her renewed ambitions had become manifest by 339 and led to the feelings of compunction expressed in the concluding section. In the first part (342) Athens can still appear as a candidate for partnership with the new Agamemnon in designs upon Asia, but in the second part (339) this is no longer so, since Athens is now at war with Philip; and so the praise of Athens is confined to her pre-Solonian history and 'constitution'. Zucker seems to

admit, however, that the denunciation of Sparta which pervades both parts had little to do with practical politics, and the case for regarding the work as new and positive political propaganda (that is, where it is not concerned with vindicating Isocrates' teaching career) appears unconvincing.

J. TATE

University of Sheffield

S. H. BUTCHER: *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*, with a critical text and translation of *The Poetics*. With a prefatory essay on Aristotelian Literary Criticism by JOHN GASSNER. Pp. lxxvi+421. New York: Dover Publications, 1951. Paper. \$1.95.

THIS is a complete reprint of the corrected (1911) fourth edition. The continued usefulness of Butcher's text and commentary, however much one may question many of his statements, is undeniable, though it can never have been correct to say with Mr. Gassner that 'Butcher's commentary leaves nothing to be desired'. Gassner is very successful in showing the relevance of the old principles and the old problems (plot *versus* character, narrative *versus* drama, etc.) to modern developments in both critical and creative writing (romanticism, symbolism, and the rest); so much so that one wonders whether he is right in saying that 'in America the classical tradition is virtually extinct', and ought not rather to have said that it survives in strange forms and unexpected places.

J. TATE

University of Sheffield

Aristoteles Latinus, iv. 3: *Analytica Posteriora*, Gerardo Cremonensi interprete edidit LAURENTIUS MINIO-PALUELLO. Pp. xxxv+139. Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1954. Paper.

GERARD of Cremona (d. 1187), who worked at Toledo, was a prolific translator of Aristotle and of other Greek authors from the Arabic. Dr. Minio-Paluello has now brought out the *editio princeps* of his *Posterior Analytics*, following on the anonymous translation (from the Greek) which appeared in 1953 and was reviewed in *C.R.* lx.

The text rests on three manuscripts: C (Cantab. Bibl. Univ. Mm. 1. 18), which is the best and belongs to the early fourteenth century; T (Tolet. Bibl. Capit. 77. 14), dating from before the middle of the thirteenth century; and P (Paris. Bibl. Nat. lat. 14700), from the beginning of the fourteenth century. There are also several other Latin manuscripts of the *Posterior Analytics* which contain readings of Gerard's in the margin, and the editor has set out their interrelations, together with those of C, P, and T, in stemma form on p. xv; the common ancestor is, he argues, Gerard's autograph.

Minio-Paluello's preface, however, deals not simply with the establishment of Gerard's version, but also with its sources and connexions, which he has previously discussed more fully in 'Note sull' Aristotele latino medievale IV' (*Rivista di Filosofia Neo-Scolastica*, xliii [1951], 97-124); see also R. Walzer, 'New Light on the Arabic Translations of Aristotle' (*Oriens*, vi [1953], 91-142, esp. 129 ff.); he argues (against Steinschneider) that Gerard was not dependent directly on the Arabic version of Abu Bishr Matta (tenth century), recently published in Cairo (1949), but on another, now lost, which was based on that and was intended to present the work in a fuller and clearer form. Abu Bishr's translation was itself made from the Syriac version of Ishaq ibn Hunain (c. A.D. 900), and so it is natural that for establishing a text so well preserved in the Greek as the *Posterior Analytics* Gerard's Latin version should be of no real use. It is in fact usually impossible to be certain what the Greek exemplar lying behind Gerard read in passages where variant readings are attested, but it tended to follow B and n (on which see Ross's *Analytics*, pp. 87-93).

There are, however, yet further affiliations which Minio-Paluello examines, for Averroes in his *Media Expositio* of the *Posterior Analytics* (extant in the Arabic, and also in Hebrew and Latin translations) used the Arabic version which served as Gerard's exemplar, and also in his *Commentarius Magnus* (lost in the Arabic, but extant in the Hebrew version of Calonymus and in Latin translations from this) so far as Book i is concerned: when he came to Book ii Averroes used Abu Bishr instead.

Apart from the preface, text, and apparatus, the editor gives in one appendix a supplementary list of less important readings, and in another some representative passages as found in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Latin versions of Averroes' *Commentarius Magnus* and *Expositio Media*. There is an *Index verborum*. The volume has been pre-

pared with the editor's accustomed care and thoroughness.

D. A. REES

Jesus College, Oxford

J. A. K. THOMSON: *The Ethics of Aristotle*. Pp. 320. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1955. Paper, 2s. 6d. net.

THE reissue by Penguin Books of this translation of the *Ethics*, first published at a much higher price in 1953, deserves a warm welcome.

The great merit of the translation is that it successfully presents Aristotle in more or less modern dress. The *Ethics* at last reads not unlike a philosopher's lectures, with something of the freedom of oral style. Such an attempt at 'reconstituting' Aristotle was well worth making: the difficulties which an exacter version in the manner of Ross must inevitably present to the Greekless reader are largely avoided; and if a good deal of the present rendering can fairly be called paraphrase, this after all is the time-honoured fashion of Aristotelian interpretation.

The work of translation has been done with a high standard of accuracy and considerable ingenuity. A few connecting sentences are left out; otherwise, the text is complete, and it is supplemented by good chapter-summaries. The only device to which exception may be taken is the habit of transferring sentences to footnotes. This involves singling out some of the many more or less parenthetical parts of the argument and putting them where they will either be forgotten or attract undeserved attention. This use of the footnote is not uncommon in recent translations: I am not sure that it ever serves much purpose, and suspect that it is particularly out of place here, where, as Thomson very rightly says (p. 24), the reader should 'not think that he is reading a book but that he is listening to a man speaking'. Examples are too numerous to quote: but for the few of which it could firmly be said that a modern writer would have used a footnote here (e.g. all those on p. 52), there are many which seem to me only to irritate and distract.

The brief introduction deals with Aristotle's life, the fortunes of his works, and the medieval and modern attitudes to him. Inevitably, it contains a good deal of speculation (especially Jaeger's) presented dogmatically; but it is an interesting and attractive essay. Thomson perhaps makes too much

of the contrast between Aristotle's Platonizing and later periods, and of the empirical materials of the *Ethics*—the philosopher's case-book.

Rackham's Loeb text is used. I have not noted anything seriously misleading; but it must be remembered that this is a translation of quite a different type and purpose from that of Ross.

D. A. RUSSELL

St. John's College, Oxford

*Griechische Papyri der Hamburger Staats- und Universitäts-Bibliothek mit einigen Stücken aus der Sammlung Hugo Ibscher.* Herausgegeben vom Seminar für Klassische Philologie der Universität Hamburg. Pp. xii+206; 15 plates. Hamburg: J. J. Augustin, 1954. Stiff paper, DM. 30.

THOUGH not numbered, and differing in format from vol. i, this is really the second volume of the Hamburg papyri. It is the work of the Classical Seminar as a whole, but Professor Snell, who writes the preface, no doubt supervised it throughout, and, though much of it is anonymous, the names of individuals are mentioned in several cases. It is a remarkable addition to papyrus publications, containing a high proportion of interesting texts, largely of the Ptolemaic period. Literary papyri are numerous and important, and there are twenty-five documents, all but one early Ptolemaic. The first text (118) is clearly the *Archelaus* of Euripides (twenty-one complete or almost complete lines; 119 is perhaps part of the same); 120 (twenty-one lines only slightly imperfect) may be Menander's *Kekryphalos* (note the couplet [ἀπό μη]χανῆς τις τῶν θεῶν σοι, Παρμένων, | [μνάς δ]έκα δέδωκεν ὥσπερ ἐν τραγωιδίαι), conceivably dating from the author's lifetime. Other notable new texts are 121, an anthology (2nd cent. B.C.), containing Aratus, 480 ff. (the earliest authority); 128 (c. 200 B.C.), perhaps Theophrastus, *Περὶ Αἰέως*; 129 (1st cent. B.C.), an interesting anthology of spurious letters; 132, possibly (but very doubtfully) Lysias; and 133, a speech against a certain Zoilus. Among papyri of known authors may be mentioned 153 (Homer, *Il.* xi and xii, c. 200 B.C., with many *plus* verses; in xi. 272 it confirms a conjecture by Bentley), 154 (Homer, *Od.* xvi. 153–67, 175–8, 2nd cent. B.C.), and 165 (Aeschines, c. *Ctes.* 194–200, textually interesting). 166 is a paradigm of ποίεω, on the

verso of P. Hamb. i. 68, an Aphrodito papyrus; though the document on the recto does not concern Dioscorus it seems likely that the roll belonged to him, like P. Cairo Masp. ii. 67176 (on the verso of a Coptic contract in his hand). The three long columns are apparently written parallel to the breadth, not the length, of the roll, which the editors think was intended to hang on the wall. But Dioscorus wrote in this way his Greek-Coptic glossary (*Aegyptus*, vi. 177–226), and the arrangement is probably due merely to a change of technique: documents were now written not in columns along the fibres but in one long column across them, and the writer of these paradigms, like Dioscorus, wrote his three columns in this way. 167 is a Latin declamation (2nd–3rd cent.).

The documents are all interesting: 168 (3rd cent. B.C.) contains regulations concerning the initiation of legal proceedings, and 169–81 are important for banking practice. The one non-Ptolemaic document, 192, is an interesting letter of the third century from a woman to her sister. The editor is mistaken in saying that the diminutive ἐντόλιον is new; see P. Bremen 20. 8. His note on ll. 18–19 may also be doubted. The passage reads: ἐπεμψά σοι τὸ ἐλαιον ἀξιόν σου. εἶδέναι δέ σε θέλω, ὅτι πρόστεμιόν ἐστιν καὶ μάλισ ἐλαβον τὸν χοῦν πρὸς δρ[α]χμᾶς δεχοκτά. The editor, taking πρόστεμιον as a noun and remarking that neither of the attested meanings, 'Strafe' and 'Gebühr', suits here, suggests 'Preisauflschlag'. But may not the word be an adjective (also unattested) agreeing with ἐλαιον and meaning something like our 'above par', i.e. here, 'at an inflated price'?

The volume is sumptuously produced, with excellent plates, and the editorial work is of high quality. There is an appendix by C. Habicht on the chronology of the third century B.C.

H. I. BELL

Aberystwyth

ROBERT DEVREESE: *Introduction à l'étude des manuscrits grecs.* Pp. viii+347; 18 plates. Paris: Klincksieck, 1954. Paper, 2,800 fr.

THIS admirable book makes no pretence to originality. The first part (chapters i–viii) attempts and achieves with remarkable success a survey of Greek writing and of the history of Greek books from the earliest times until the twentieth century A.D. It includes eighteen plates bearing photographs of pages from eighteen uncial and minuscule manu-



scripts dated from the sixth to the eleventh centuries. The second part (chapters ix–xix) deals individually with the history of Greek texts falling within specified categories: the Old Testament and the New Testament, Law, Grammar, Rhetoric, Dialectic, Exact Sciences, Alchemy, etc., Medicine, and Military Sciences. Chapter xx is concerned with the way in which manuscripts should be described—format, contents, provenance, and history—and an appendix offers a list of manuscripts with references to the printed books in which they are represented by photographs. This list is, with very few exceptions, restricted to manuscripts bearing a definite date and covers the period A.D. 800–1593, giving examples belonging to the great majority of years in the tenth to the sixteenth centuries, and thirteen belonging to years in the ninth century. For reasons that are not plain the list is headed by an uncial manuscript of Dioscorides to which is assigned the approximate date of A.D. 512. The ancient uncial manuscripts of the Bible, though they might be dated with no less imprecision, are not mentioned.

Devreesse calls his book an introduction, and an introduction it is in that it deals in summary fashion with many topics which have been treated at greater length or still await such treatment. His object is to assemble material for the assistance of scholars who may wish to follow up particular lines of inquiry. His selection of special categories may seem strange. The Old and New Testaments were obvious choices, but it may be asked why he did not give similar treatment to at least one of the main literary forms in the secular field. His purpose, however, is not to deal in detail with particular literary forms as represented by examples which are extant more or less in their entirety, but to call attention to extracts and summaries of lost works and to the multifarious writings which existed side by side with them and with works still extant and which in one way or another may have influenced the form in which those works have been transmitted. For want of a better arrangement he chose to use the *trivium* and *quadrivium* of the ancient world and the middle ages: the *trivium* covering Grammar, Rhetoric, and Dialectic, and the *quadrivium* covering Arithmetic, Geometry, Astronomy, and Music, to which he has added as derivatives Alchemy and other pseudo-sciences, Medicine, and Military Sciences. Under these ten headings he is able to include almost everything that was the subject of a Greek book.

The book is well documented throughout and concludes with a useful general index

and indexes of papyri and manuscripts that are cited.

R. M. RATTENBURY

Trinity College, Cambridge

W. BEARE: *The Roman Stage*. Second edition. Pp. xiv+365; 8 plates, 8 figs. London: Methuen, 1955. Cloth, 37s. 6d.

A GOOD book has been made better by some revision and considerable additions, and above all by extensive documentation, which will be generally welcomed. The chapter on Terence has been rewritten, and though still controversial—for the author has not changed his views—now gives a much fuller picture of the dramatist and his methods. The discussion of 'contamination' has been largely transferred to an appendix. I do not think that Professor Beare has improved his case, but the conclusions are perhaps more moderately expressed. The other revised chapter—on Greek New Comedy—differs from its original chiefly in a change of tone: it seems more sceptical (especially about the influence of Euripides) and even a trifle cynical. We may sympathize with the author's dislike of over-confident theorizing, and yet feel that his reaction against it is often stronger than it need be.

Of the other new appendixes two cite, with reasonable comments, the evidence for the use of masks and scenery in the Roman theatre (the one on masks being a modified reprint from *C.Q.* xxxiii. 139–46). Another gives the text of the Oxyrhynchus Mime (misprints at 144 and 187), with a free translation and notes. The translation reads rather oddly; there is surely an error at 166; and it is not clear why certain innocent phrases are omitted, some with marks of omission and others (e.g. at 130 and 154) without. The last appendix discusses Accent, Ictus, and Rhythm, with illustrations of the various metres. This will be helpful to many; it would be more helpful if the treatment were not at times aporetic to the pitch of pure scepticism ('There is no answer to these questions', p. 316). Even if the influence of stress-accent on dramatic prosody is still very obscure, it is too soon to proclaim the problem insoluble. The parallel metrical examples from English verse provide a pleasant aid for novices, but one or two are questionable and may mislead. In some of the Latin examples quantity-marks are omitted or misplaced; note especially the astonishing *uāe uobis* for *uāe uōbis* (p. 321). There are other indications of hasty proof-correction: p. xii

last item; p. 326 n. 1 'phylakes' *passim*; p. 328 n. 11 for '109 f.' read '107 f.'; p. 334 l. 2 for 'ans' read 'aus'. (One may regret that Latin technical terms are no longer italicized; hence, presumably, the hybrid 'syllable anceps', p. 317.) The source-references, however (if the small proportion that it has been practicable to check is representative), seem to be accurate, and that is what matters most. Thus even those who disagree strongly with the author's views must be grateful to him for making his stimulating handbook an even richer store of information.

HUGH TREDENNICK

Royal Holloway College,  
University of London

HELLFRIED DAHLMANN: *Der Bienenstaat in Vergils Georgica*. (Akad. der Wiss. u. der Lit. in Mainz, Abh. d. Geistes- und Sozialwiss. Kl., 1954, 10.) Pp. 18. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1954. Paper, DM. 1.80.

THIS is a concise discussion of the symbolism in the fourth book of the *Georgics*. Dahlmann begins with an analysis of the chapter in Seneca (*De Clem.* i. 19) where the kingdom of the bees is used as an illustration to show that monarchy is a natural political organization for a State, and he considers how far Virgil's description of the bees had a similar intention. He illustrates well how Virgil again and again makes us think of the bees in terms of human society, and how the bees differ from the rest of Virgil's plant and animal kingdom in providing for themselves that *cura* and *labor* which in other cases humans must provide. They alone have *ratio*, and a share in the divine *lóyos*. He argues that the whole passage is essentially a *παράδειγμα*, and by a comparison with the end of *Georgics* ii he shows how the society of the bees reflects the family love, the economic sufficiency based on toil, the freedom from civil dissensions which characterize the farmer who follows the old Roman virtues. He concludes that Virgil was showing how the social behaviour of bees was that which best befitted the citizens of Rome, and their organization under their 'king' was like that of the new Rome under Augustus. Indeed the fight between the rival 'kings' in certain ways symbolized the struggle between Augustus and Antony.

At many points Dahlmann's sensitive analysis stimulates and enriches our appreciation of Virgil; but the problem in sym-

bolic interpretation of classical literature is how far to go. Modern literature may often have symbolism as its primary intention, the actual 'subject' being of secondary importance, sometimes doing no more than serving the symbolism; but for the ancient authors form and structure and 'subject' were of far greater importance. The fourth book of the *Georgics* (like much else in Virgil) is rich in suggesting to its readers different levels of meaning and significance at the same time, but it is in no sense an allegory. It is about bees before it is about anything else. Dahlmann is progressively specific in his analysis of the symbolism, especially on the point of monarchy. Seneca's subject after all was political behaviour; Virgil's was not. It is for this reason that I think Dahlmann has pressed his point too far.

R. D. WILLIAMS

University of Reading

Appendix Vergiliana. Testo, introduzione e traduzione a cura di REMO GIOMINI. Pp. liii+282. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1953. Paper, L. 2500.

THIS edition is very bad. 'A prudent editor', wrote Housman of the Appendix, 'will be slow to emend the text and slow to defend it, and his page will bristle with the obelus.' There is one obelus, and one alone, to be found here, and that is in the Addenda, where it is desperately employed to retrieve a false quantity at *Cir.* 477. The tremendous howler at *Cul.* 27 is also corrected; but *Cir.* 350 (*mānē* = 'morning') and 450 (*lābascunt*) are left to shift as best they may, as is *Cul.* 318. The editor's grasp of metre is, to put it mildly, uncertain: witness *egō* (*Lyd.* 156, *Priap.* 3. 1), the admission of a spondee to the fourth foot of a pure iambic (*Cat.* 13. 35; cf. *Priap.* 2. 3), the division of the tribrach in *inflataque rhotho* (*Cat.* 5. 2), and the hexameters *Castra foro castra, urbi praepondere castra* (*Cat.* 9. 43) and *Nestoris annosa vixisses saecula, si me . . .* (*Maec.* 139). Nor is his latinity above suspicion: there are solecisms scattered throughout the apparatus criticus (see, for example, the notes at *Dir.* 103, *Mor.* 35 *et al.*, *Cat.* 11 *fin.*), and even snatches of his native tongue (*Dir.* 91, 103, *Priap.* 3 *init.*; cf. *Aetna* 73). A perusal of the text reveals false concord (*Cir.* 471-2 *Venus . . . Sunius* 'il Sunio sacro a Venere'; it will not do to blame this on to Haupt, who wrote *sinus . . . Sunius*), gibberish (*Cir.* 128 *corpellae*), and occasional barbarisms, not all of which are misprints

(*Maec.* 107 *Scyllia*, *Aetna* 90 *Danae* dative). In the light of these passages is it unworthy to suspect the editor of construing *propter* with the genitive at *Cul.* 3 ('sia per una zanzara il mio verso non privo di dottrina...')?

A conservative editor who will not obelize is as arrogant in his way as the wildest 'restorer'; for he pretends to understand what puzzled Scaliger and Heinsius, Bachrens and Vollmer, Munro and Housman. If, however, he tries, albeit perversely, to explain and justify his nonsensical text, one may yet bear with him; but the translation which is here the reader's only guide serves mainly as a verbal smoke-screen to cover the editor's retreat. To assess the quality of his text it may not be amiss to compare it with that of Vollmer-Morel (itself, it need hardly be said, not impeccable). In *Culex*, *Ciris*, *Dirae*, *Copa*, *Moretum*, *Catalepton*, *Eleg.* in *Maec.*, and *Aetna* 1-119—for I admit without much shame that I did not persevere beyond this point, and omitted the Ausonian poems altogether in my reading—I find that it differs significantly in some 240 places: in about 20 per cent. it seems to me to be an improvement (usually because it discards Vollmer's 'corrections'), in about 30 per cent. it is equally good (or bad), and in the remaining 50 per cent. the change is for the worse—not infrequently it is disastrous. None of the editor's own emendations seems to me convincing; some are comparatively harmless (for instance, *Cul.* 245, *Cir.* 5 ff., 266, 349, *Lyd.* 169, *Mor.* 75); some are appalling. Let me charitably ignore these last, and pass rapidly in review some of the more arresting examples of the editor's 'metodo accanitamente conservatore': *Cul.* 20-21 *sancta Pales*, *ad quem ventura recurrit* | *agrestum bona fetura* 'ai cui pedi il rozzo contadino ama deporre le primizie dei campi'; 166 *vibranti* . . . *linguae* 'con la vibrante lingua'; 220 *Cerberus et diris flagrant latratibus ora* 'tremendi rintronano i latrati di Cerbero'; 287 *ultra*—why, then, did she have to be won over?; 360 *omnes Roma decus magni quos suscipit orbis* 'Roma a vita li schiuse perchè del loro onore adornassero il mondo'; *Cir.* 26 *cursum* 'carro'; 57 *monstris* . . . *infestata* 'le sue membra contaminate dai mostri'; 105-6 *Actaei quondam munita labore* | *Alcathoi Phoeique* 'di Acteo e Alcatoo e di Apollo stesso'; 155 *iura* 'la maestà lesa del nume'; 175 note on *caeli*: '*servav. cum cruce Vollmer, Ellis; causa latet*', but he prudently refrains from translating it; *Dir.* 21 *purpureo campos quae pingit avena colore* 'gli steli che rivestono i prati di biondo colore' (but *purpureus* is something of a maid-of-all-work: see *Maec.* 62 for wondrous strange snow; and the editorial comment '*Sin miro errore* [!] *ex*

*purpureas v. 60 ductum esse consideremus* . . .'); *Maec.* 177-8, where the translation seems to indicate that he construes the words *deus* . . . *insignis* . . . *te* together (he forgot perhaps to cite *Prop.* i. 8. 19-20 by way of parallel); *Aetna* 49 *Pelion Ossa creat* 'l'Ossa, partorito dalle rocce del Pelio'.

One is naturally inclined to regret that the *Graz* fragment was not discovered in time to figure in this edition, but it is equally natural to wonder whether in the hands of this editor it might not have been an instrument of depravation rather than of improvement. I cannot resist drawing attention to its signal vindication of Haupt's *venientem ignem* at *Cir.* 350 and of Heinsius's *liuescunt* at 450. It may be that such discoveries (not that this is a new phenomenon) will do more than the harsh words of splenetic reviewers to convince conservative editors that conjecture need not be solely the last refuge of despair.

E. J. KENNEY

Peterhouse, Cambridge

O. A. W. DILKE: *Horace, Epistles* i. Pp. 186. London: Methuen, 1954. Cloth, 9s.

THIS edition 'is intended mainly for the upper forms of schools and for university students taking Latin as a subsidiary subject . . . But it also tries to provide an annotated text for such Honours students as do not need an apparatus criticus.' It has a fairly full (38-page) introduction, written in the style of lecture-notes. The scale of the commentary has obviously been determined for the editor by the general plan of the series, but he has hardly made the best use of the space available: some of the more elementary notes on how to construe the Latin seem unnecessary (even for the public which the editor has in view) and could have been omitted; so too could all mention of the more fantastic theories of modern scholars (e.g. those reported at iii. 30, iv. 8-9, v. 1, vi. 51, vii. 52, x. 48, x. 50, etc.; many of these are rejected by the editor himself); and so could all irrelevant pieces of information, like the statement (which is not even true) that Cicero calls the inhabitants of Ulubrae 'little frogs' (xi. 30). On the other hand, the editor should have been much more generous in helping the student to follow the development of Horace's thought in each of the *Epistles*; the summaries which precede the notes are so short and superficial as to be practically useless, and sometimes (e.g. at i. 20-26) they are quite misleading; in the

notes themselves it is only seldom that the editor explains what he takes to be the connexion of thought (one such passage is vii. 14, where his explanation is weak). At no point does one get the impression that he has studied the text with the close attention which it both deserves and demands, in the way in which, for example, Courbaud did. (Courbaud's excellent book is mentioned in one footnote of the introduction and in the bibliography, but nowhere else has it had any visible effect on the edition.)

Many of the notes (especially the longer ones) are badly written: the expression is not only awkward but often misleading and sometimes (as at i. 56) both confused and confusing. From an excess of caution, the editor over-qualifies his statements with 'probably', 'evidently', 'appear to have been', 'will have been', until these words become mere mannerisms of style. It is sometimes difficult to distinguish errors of fact from laxities of expression, but there are far too many of both; perhaps the most remarkable statement is at xvi. 23 (on *manibus unctis*): 'The Romans ate with their fingers, and oil was the soap of the ancient world.' The few original remarks (e.g. at i. 56, iii. 14, xi. 7-10, xx. 23) are hardly worth making.

W. S. WATT

University of Aberdeen

FRANCO MUNARI: P. Ovidi Nasonis *Amores*. Testo, introduzione, traduzione e note. (Bibl. di Studi Superiori, Vol. xi.) Seconda edizione. Pp. xxxvii + 229. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1955. Paper.

MUNARI's important edition of the *Amores* was first published in 1951 (see *C.R.* n.s. ii [1952], 175-7). It is pleasant to be able to welcome a second edition so soon. The pagination is the same. There is no change in the Introduction. I have noticed the following changes in the text: i. 12. 18 *durās* for *diras*; ii. 4. 11 *in humum* for *in me*—an attractive conjecture of S. Timpanaro, jr. (cf. iii. 6. 67); ii. 15. 11 *si cupiam dominae* for *†te cupiam dominae†*; iii. 9. 61 *venies* for *venias*; iii. 13. 36 *sit* for *sint*. A few new references have been added to the citations of parallel passages. But the main difference between this and the first edition is to be found in the critical apparatus, and especially in the removal from it of a good many conjectures. In Book i, for example, the apparatus has

been shortened by about twenty-five lines; Bentley is the chief sufferer here—his name disappears from some twenty places. In the text the printer has not been as careful as in the first edition; there are several places where letters, especially *l*, have fallen out.

Those who think that a critical apparatus should contain only the barest minimum of information will still regard Munari's as too long. Those, on the other hand, who wish to be saved the labour of finding out what conjectures have been made on a given passage may well prefer his apparatus in its earlier form.

A. G. LEE

St. John's College, Cambridge

*The Metamorphoses of Ovid*: an English version by A. E. WATTS with the etchings of PABLO PICASSO. Pp. xvi + 397; ten etchings. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1955. Cloth, 37s. 6d. net.

MR. WATTS began this translation of the *Metamorphoses* almost by accident in 1942 when he turned a few lines of the eighth book into heroic couplets in the hope of conveying to his class some impression of the style and rhythm of the original. He enjoyed the task, and when finished it gave pleasure to others, so that he felt encouraged to tackle the complete poem. The result is an excellent translation that sounds the authentic Ovidian note. One may hope that eventually it will be published in a cheaper edition and made available to a much wider audience. The sample quotations that follow, chosen more or less at random, will show its quality better than any discussion or description of mine.

By chance the youth, who missed his comrades, cried:

'Is any here?' and 'Here,' the nymph replied. Amazed, he looked all round him, but in vain;

And calling: 'Come', himself was called again.

He looked behind, and called, as none was nigh,

'Why shun me?' and received the same reply.

*Met.* iii. 379 ff.

'His cupped hands clapped his sides, and in he went,

And swimming in that crystal element, Shone luminous, as cased in glass are seen White lilies, or an ivory figurine.'

iv. 352 ff.

When boyhood thus gave way to manly  
prime,

They joined the Argonauts at sailing-time,  
And shared their quest across untraveled  
seas

In the first ship, to find the Golden Fleece.

vi. 719 ff.

Baskets of apples flung their scent in air,  
And nuts and figs and wrinkled dates were  
there,

With plums, and grapes fresh-plucked  
with purple bloom,  
And in the midst white honey in the comb.

viii. 674 ff.

Here is no crested bird, with summons clear,  
To wake the dawn; no watchdog, quick of  
ear,

Nor quicker goose, disturbs the silence here.

xi. 597 ff.

Like wave impelled by wave, which onward  
speeds,

Both driven itself, and driving what pre-  
cedes,

So flee the times, and follow as they flee,  
For ever new: what was, has ceased to be;  
What has not been, is born, as, one by one,  
Created ever new, the moments run.

xv. 181 ff.

The ten etchings by Picasso, taken from a  
set first published in 1931, show what power-  
ful effects a master can achieve with the  
utmost economy of line, but their spirit is  
quite different from that of the translation.

A. G. LEE

St. John's College, Cambridge

JOHN WILLIAM SPAETH: *Index ver-  
borum Ciceronis poeticorum fragmentorum*.  
Pp. ix+130. Urbana: University of  
Illinois Press, 1955. Cloth, \$3.50.

IN prefixing to his index an 'Additamentum  
ad apparatus criticum' Mr. Spaeth follows  
the plan of W. A. Oldfather's index to  
Cicero's Letters, but while Oldfather's very  
useful supplement contained only critical  
proposals made after the publication of the  
Oxford text, Spaeth collects not only emen-  
dations which are not in Baehrens's appa-  
ratus (he has missed two corrections by  
Housman—on 8-9 and 105—published in  
his *Manilius*) but also manuscript readings  
not recorded by Baehrens which he has  
elicited from other sources. These, together  
with all the readings cited by Baehrens, how-  
ever unlike what Cicero can be supposed to  
have written, appear again in the index it-  
self, belying its title, since many of them are  
not *verba* at all, and, since they are a more or

less fortuitous collection (scores of the same  
sort could be added, if anyone thought it  
worth while, from the collations published  
by Buescu after Spaeth's work was  
finished in 1939), serving no purpose that  
can readily be imagined. Copyists' mis-  
readings like *virgula* for *ungula*, *humores* for  
*humeros*, *viginti* for *viginti*, *mulgens* for *mulcens*,  
everyday misspellings like *peccoris*, *orribilis*,  
*peremni*, *trunculentus*, *scorpius*, *flammina*, *re-  
coepit*, even monstrosities like *exortarii*, *ste-  
stillae*, *virein*, *utridi*, *ruticu*, *acervibus*, *tornareca*,  
and *capudydrae* are elaborately recorded; at  
*N.D.* ii. 159 a manuscript has *exortae pente* for  
*exorta repente*, and so *pente* qualifies for a place.  
Almost all these ghosts are dignified with  
independent entries, but a few are foisted on  
respectable words: *arciuit* is here (because a  
copyist once wrote *arciuit* for *asciuit*) under  
the lemma *arceo*; *labantur*, a miswriting for  
*labuntur*, is under *labo*, and *fasta*, an error for  
*fausta*, under *fastus*. We cannot say with  
certainty how Cicero wrote the name of  
Andromeda's mother, but we can confidently  
say that he did not write it *Casiephea* or  
*Cassioepia* or *Carsiaepia*; these freaks have no  
relevance to him, but each has its entry here.  
And not only the illiteracies of scribes but  
the idiosyncracies of editors are respected:  
*necessitas* and *Necessitas* have separate entries,  
side by side, with the same reference; so have  
*septem* and *Septem*, *triones* and *Triones*.

The bibliography includes Buescu's edi-  
tion of 1941 but not the same author's studies  
of the textual tradition of the *Aratea* in his  
*Problèmes de Critique et d'Histoire Textuelles*  
(Bucharest and Paris, 1942), pp. 49-225.

One's gratitude for the labour which com-  
pilers of indexes put into their work is  
mingled with regret that so much unprofit-  
able labour should have been spent on this  
one.

C. J. FORDYCE

University of Glasgow

SELATIE EDGAR STOUT: *Scribe and Critic  
at Work in Pliny's Letters*. Notes on the  
History and the Present Status of the  
Text. Pp. xiv+272. Bloomington:  
Indiana University Press, 1954.  
Cloth, \$7.50.

PROFESSOR STOUT gives the impression of  
being too modest a man to claim that his  
erudite book is designed for the use of editors.  
It will, in fact, serve that purpose, among  
others. Any reader capable of submitting to  
the discipline its study imposes will also find,  
as he works his way slowly through it, that

he is enjoying a rich and rare humanistic experience.

A brief introductory chapter deals with the descent of Pliny's correspondence in the three corpuses known as the nine-book (X), eight-book (Y), and ten-book (Z) families. The author's fundamental thesis, already known from his article in *T.A.P.A.* lv (1924), is enunciated, viz, that the first two of these families derive from a common parent, and that the ten-book tradition took shape in Italy, towards the end of the fifth century, by amalgamation of an independent corpus of i-ix, interest in which had been revived by Sidonius Apollinaris towards the end of his life, with a manuscript of the correspondence with Trajan. The argumentation is based primarily on omissions and errors in which X and Y agree as against Z, all instances which, in the author's opinion, exemplify editorial 'improvements' in the Z tradition being conscientiously excluded. The XY omissions in ii. 17, ii. 19, 5, and iv. 12, 3, all due to a 'jump' of the copyist's eye, would alone prove the case even without the numerous minor instances of concord in error that can be brought into the argument. From the fundamental thesis stated above emerges the principle that in cases of disagreement between X and Y, Y supported by Z is no less authoritative than X supported by Z.

Chapter i, on 'Evaluating the Sources of the Text', is of extreme interest and value. The transmission of the three traditions, the intermarriage between the separate lines of Y ( $\delta$  and  $\theta$ , of which the latter is shown to be anterior to the former) and F, a member of the Z family, and the characteristics of the individual manuscripts (especially numerous in the Y family) are exhaustively treated, down to the culmination of the manuscript tradition in the early printed editions, 1471-1508, notably those of Catanaeus and Aldus. Among matters of outstanding interest are the so-called Guarinian recension; the implications of the discovery and dating of the uncial *Morgan Fragment* in relation to the genesis of family Z; the proof that the 1474 edition was printed from a library manuscript, and not, as previously thought, from a copy of the 1471 *editio princeps*, and the problem of Aldus's procedure in using Jucundus's transcript of P. On the last point Stout is acute in his argumentation (pp. 70 ff.) for the view of Keil and Merrill as against Rand's opinion that Aldus clung tenaciously to P. Among matters of secondary importance, yet of great humanistic interest, that reward the reader of these austere pages, are Merrill's discovery in 1899 of Laetus's

annotated copy of the 1483 edition and the conclusion imposed by this discovery concerning the affiliation of Laetus's own edition of 1490; the fact that Erasmus, when working on his *Adagia* in the house of Aldus in 1508, on the eve of the publication of Aldus's edition of Pliny, employed for purposes of quotation the edition of Catanaeus (1506), thus missing such an admirable Aldine reading as *καταστροφῶν* in v. 17. 2 (yet Catanaeus had done palmary work on the Greek passages in Pliny); and the account of Fra Giocondo (Jucundus), architect of the Pont Notre Dame, epigraphist, manuscript-hunter, editor of Latin classics, and scholarly benefactor both of Budaëus and of Aldus.

Chapters ii and iii are entitled 'The Scribe at Work' and 'The Critic at Work' respectively. Here the rules set forth in the introductory chapter and the consequent evaluation of the manuscripts discussed in Chapter i are applied to numerous variant readings in the text of the *Letters*. Not only are the errors characteristic of the minuscule script of various periods, those due to erroneous divisions in continuous script, and the mechanical accidents that produce such results as dittography or omission, brought under examination, but the copyist's individual mentality is investigated and, as far as possible, defined. Rich material is here provided for selective, diagnostic, and remedial action on the part of editors; I say this primarily because it seems that Stout would be the first to admit that, though Schuster may at present hold the field, that field is, as Miss Guillemin has recently said, 'large ouvert aux initiatives personnelles' (*Rev. des Ét. Lat.* xxxii [1954], 381). Chapter iii deals with the good and bad done to the text of Pliny by critics from the Renaissance to the present time. The main argument, which, but for the excesses of those by whom Pliny has been over-edited, especially in modern times, it might seem unnecessary to advance today, is that emendation is useless and harmful unless based on (1) a close and sympathetic appreciation of the author's idiosyncracies of style and expression (e.g. Plinian *ellipsis*), and (2) an authoritative evaluation and interpretation of the manuscript evidence.

Chapter iv deals with a large number of disputed readings, and is an important contribution to the detailed study of Pliny's text.

At the end of the book there are eleven pages of notes and an index of readings discussed.

W. S. MAGUINNESS

King's College, London



Apuleius: *Metamorphoseos* Libri xi. Traduzione di FERDINANDO CARLESI, testo critico riveduto da NICOLA TERZAGHI. Pp. xxxiii + 313 (double). Florence: Sansoni, 1954. Cloth, L. 4000.

THIS attractively printed but very thick volume follows the general lines of those of the Budé series. Its importance lies in the Italian translation, which is lively and readable. The literary quality of Carlesi's work cannot be fully appraised by anyone not deeply familiar with Italian, but it is obvious from his preface that he has given much thought to the problems of appropriate style, and his comments on many points, for instance on the differences between the Latin and the Italian use of diminutives, are interesting. In general his handling of language may seem to a foreigner to be excessively sober: in the first chapter, for instance, *linguam Attidem* becomes *lingua greca*, *urbe Latia* becomes *Roma*, and *Quiritium* becomes *romani*. He argues effectively, however, against attempts to force on modern speech an imitative euphuism alien to its genius.

But a reviewer who cannot claim competence in this difficult field should confine himself to Terzaghi's text, with its introductory note and accompanying apparatus. On the theoretical side there is here a good deal to criticize. The introductory note is based chiefly on Giarratano, for whom he asserts a degree of novelty, in connexion with Class I and the Book VIII supplements, which that most generous scholar would be the last to claim. Unlike Giarratano, however, he believes in the survival, at least till the fourteenth century, of at least one descendant of F's archetype, independent of F and superior to it, which has given to the later manuscripts (especially to A), and to F's and  $\phi$ 's correctors, valuable readings unknown to F. This is a dangerous heresy, but in practice it makes little difference to Terzaghi's text, which is on the whole a cautiously conservative modification of Helm's and Giarratano's. The apparatus is chiefly a simplified version of Giarratano's, with little reference to the Budé edition, and the result, though somewhat imperfect in detail, is adequate as a basis for the translation.

D. S. ROBERTSON

Trinity College, Cambridge

425 and 428). Pp. 493; 1 ill. in text; 7 maps in pocket. Lund, Gleerup, 1955. Paper, Kr. 40.

DESPITE a sentimental cover-design reproduced from an eighteenth-century drawing, this monograph has nothing amateurish about it, but is the work of a serious and well-informed *Märchenforscher*, a pupil of the late Professor von Sydow, who has assembled a formidable mass of material and a bibliography extending to some 50 pages; add to it, however, H. Wagenvoort in *Jaarboek der K. Nederlandse Akad. van Wetenschappen*, 1953-4, pp. 243-52. Most of the argument is of a highly technical character alien to the interests of this periodical. When Swahn grapples with Apuleius' famous story (pp. 373 ff.) he is handicapped to some extent by imperfect classical knowledge. The water of Styx which Psyche is sent to fetch becomes 'wells of Kokytos' (the allusion in *Metam.* vi. 13 to *Od.* x. 514 has misled him); he not only translates *pyxis* by 'pot' but argues (p. 430) from the supposition that it is an earthenware vessel; he slanders the daughter of Cupid and Psyche with the name Voluptuousness, and goes to no earlier author than Nonnos for the tale of Semele (p. 380). However, his attempts to trace the history of the story, i.e. of the combination of motifs which make it up, are interesting in themselves, denounce, with great justice, certain wild theories which have grown up around Apuleius and around folk-tales in general, and open up several intriguing possibilities. His tone throughout is modest, and he confines himself to that subject which he has studied, the natural history of *Märchen*, so to call it, eschewing such things as the question of the relation of some or any of the motifs to known or supposed ritual or myth, except when it is necessary to mention it in outlining the opinions of someone else.

H. J. ROSE

St. Andrews

CARL BECKER: (1) Tertullian: *Apologeticum*. Verteidigung des Christentums—Lateinisch und Deutsch. (2) Tertullians *Apologeticum*. Werden und Leistung. Pp. 317, 383. Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1952, 1954. Cloth, DM. 22, 24.80.

THIS work is already famous. To praise it would be an impertinence: to criticise it is probably beyond the competence of anyone

JAN-ÖJVIND SWAHN: *The Tale of Cupid and Psyche* (Aarne-Thompson

less learned than the author himself. It must suffice to outline briefly the contents of the two volumes, while drawing attention to a few of their more notable features.

(1) contains an introduction (40 pp.), followed by the Latin text and a German translation printed face to face. There are here no footnotes, but the variants between the Fuldan and the standard texts are printed in full in the next section of the book, with an apparatus criticus beneath them. There are no explanatory notes, but the commendable device of an alphabetical Register gives all the information necessary for the understanding of Tertullian's personal and general allusions. There is a short bibliography.

The Latin text is in a beautiful italic type: since the sentences do not begin with capitals, it would have been easier to read if the compositor had left a larger space after the periods. The German translation a foreigner is not competent to judge, except to say that even to him it has in a few places thrown new light on Latin with which he has been familiar for forty years. The Introduction is a notable piece of work, as well as a fine example of the dignity and clarity of the German language; if the whole work cannot (under present circumstances) appear in English, this Introduction might well do so. Among other matters it describes Tertullian's life and character as known from his writings; it has a brief sketch of Greek apologetic, and a discussion of the juristic basis of Christian trials; and it contains a masterly summary of the argument of the Apology, with the suggestion that it is one of the greatest works of Latin literature. Anticipating the detailed arguments of his succeeding volume, the author states his position that *Ad Nationes* was written early in 197, and recast as the *Apologeticum* late that same year; the *Fragmentum Fuldense* (summarized from Theophilus) was a note made by Tertullian, not for publication but for use in preparing the Apology; the Fuldan text represents the Apology in its original form, and the standard text is the completed work. It is clear that the Fuldan text was in circulation in the early centuries; it is not clear whether it was put into circulation by Tertullian, or whether, like others of his works, it was published without his authority. The *Octavius* of Minucius Felix is indebted to Tertullian. There are two pages of observations on methods of translation, which justify, and are justified by, the version which follows.

The further volume, (2), is designed to prove the theories outlined above. It does much more than that. It makes very heavy

reading, and will require and repay careful and detailed study. The contents of its five chapters can only be briefly summarized. Chapter i is an account of modern (since about 1900) discussion of the problems involved, in which the work of French, Dutch, Italian, and Swedish, as well as German, scholars is shown in its proper relations. Chapter ii concerns the two books *Ad Nationes* and their relation to the Apology; a full analysis of their argument is followed by a long discussion of passages which show signs of having needed further revision. The suggestion is that Tertullian, dissatisfied with this work, entirely recast it, thoroughly changing its tone and temper, and reissued it as the Apology. Chapter iii treats of the manuscript tradition of the Apology, the history of the problems involved, the relation of the two texts, the so-called *Fragmentum Fuldense*, and marks of lack of final polish (*unfertige Stellen*) in the Fuldan text. Chapter iv, which the author claims is the most significant part of his work, has some acute observations on Tertullian's use of language, and discusses in great detail the different factors of Tertullian's intention in the change over (*Umgestaltung*) from *Ad Nationes* to Apology, and the further revision of the latter. A section on the purpose of the work and its intended public suggests that (in spite of the forensic form of this oration) it was not Tertullian's intention to use it in court, nor his expectation that it would bring an end to persecution, but rather that it should put the Christian case before the general public; in other words, it was propaganda rather than apologetic—a conclusion with which most readers will agree. Chapter v produces arguments in favour of the proposition that Minucius Felix is subsequent to Tertullian; here again we think the author has given new expression to what was already evident.

There are three excursions: on the alleged Latin Christian *Sondersprache*, which the author thinks should be related to the general spoken Latin of the time; on the chronology of Tertullian's early writings; and on Mommsen's now exploded view of the juristic basis of imperial persecution of Christianity.

The author refers in his Introduction to R. Heinze's work (1910), *Virgils epische Technik*. In the present work he has applied and expanded Heinze's methods, indicating that we have in Tertullian that which we have nowhere else in our legacy from antiquity, the materials for watching the development of a literary work from its first casting, through several stages, to its polished finality. For this reason Dr. Becker's work may be of

interest even to such classical scholars as are not usually concerned about Christian Latin, provided they can set their teeth against grammatical forms and syntactical usages which are not Ciceronian though they have certain affinities with Tacitus, and can tolerate them in a work which, like that of Tacitus, has the uncommon merits of vigorous expression and moral sincerity.

E. EVANS

Hellifield

**ALBERT BLAISE:** *Manuel du latin chrétien*. Pp. 221. Strasbourg: Le Latin chrétien, 1955. Paper, 650 fr.

ORIGINALLY written as the introduction to the *Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens* published by M. Blaise in 1954, the present volume is now published separately for the convenience of students.

The first section (pp. 11-66) treats briefly of 'Le style chrétien' under the rubrics of vocabulary, traditional rhetoric, symbolism, figurative language, and affective language. The remainder (pp. 67-198) consists of a long and systematic series of grammatical observations, all but a few pages being devoted to syntax. There follow eight pages of index and eleven of bibliography.

In the first section, after emphasizing the stylistic distinctions between different writers and between different works of the same writer, the author concludes that the two constant features of all Christian Latin literature to the end of the patristic age are 'développement du langage figuré' and 'réchauffement des expressions affectives'. This is true as far as it goes, but the researches of the Schrijnen-Mohrmann school have enabled us to paint a much more complex and concrete picture of the growth of Christian Latin, in the sense both of the liturgical and technical language of the church and of the everyday speech of Christian communities. The trouble is that Blaise is trying to give a synchronous, descriptive treatment of something that demands historical approach.

In the grammatical section of the book the exposition is lucid and well illustrated. But here again, in spite of occasional cautions and qualifications by the author, the reader gets a false impression of uniformity. Everything from Tertullian to Gregory of Tours tends to be lumped together.

Syntax is the field in which 'special languages' are least special. Hence most of the aberrations from classical usage which Blaise

catalogues are really characteristic of late Latin rather than of Christian Latin. It would have been helpful if those deviations—in the main vulgarisms or biblical echoes—which appear to have been particularly favoured by Christian writers had been singled out for mention. On these cf. J. Schrijnen and C. Mohrmann, *Studien zur Syntax der Briefe des hl. Cyprian* (Nijmegen, 1936-7), *passim*, C. Mohrmann, 'Les éléments vulgaires du latin des chrétiens', *Vigiliae Christianae*, ii (1948), 97 ff.

The syntax of the complex sentence is exhaustively treated. The only omission noted by the reviewer is the use of causal *dum* with ellipse of the verb, not infrequent in Tertullian (cf. *T.L.L.* v. 2231. 2-13). But the syntax of the cases is less satisfactorily expounded, and prepositional usages are given short shrift: there is no mention of *ad c. acc.* replacing the dative (though the hypercorrect dative for *ad c. acc.* is illustrated on p. 88), none of the instrumental use of *in c. abl.*, none even of *credere in deum*.

Some of the oddities cited from Cassiodorus' *Variae* illustrate nothing but his desire for a good clausula, e.g. 3. 51 *quos ipse fecerat tristes, laboravit reddere laetiores*, quoted on p. 96 under the rubric 'Comparatif au lieu du positif', or 8. 17 *quem nec feruentia bella respuerunt et tranquilla otia praedicarent*, quoted on p. 179 to illustrate variation of mood in relative clauses 'sans raison apparente'.

The otherwise excellent bibliography omits Chr. Mohrmann's 1951 lecture at the Institut de Linguistique, 'L'étude de la latinité chrétienne: état de la question, méthodes, résultats', published in *Latin vulgaire, latin des chrétiens*, Paris, 1952, 17-35, perhaps the best introduction to the whole question. And the J. Fridhake to whom is attributed on p. 210 the authorship of *Études critiques et syntaxiques sur les Variae de Cassiodore*, Göteborg, 1950, should be Åke J. Fridh.

Blaise's handbook will be useful to students brought up on rigidly classical Latin grammar who have to tackle patristic texts, and will thus fulfil its main purpose.

ROBERT BROWNING

University College, London

**R. A. BROWNE:** *British Latin Selections, A.D. 500-1400*. With introduction, notes mainly linguistic and literary, and vocabulary of medieval words and meanings. Pp. lxi + 144. Oxford: Blackwell, 1954. Cloth, 32s. net.

WHEN the student of classical Latin ventures

into medieval territory, he may at first find himself much confused. The language is still Latin, but a different Latin. Familiar words have often acquired a new meaning; new words have been created in hundreds; by classical rules the syntax seems anarchic; the word order, the sentence structure, the rhythms are different; and, not surprisingly, he may feel a certain disappointment or even distaste. But he will miss much if he turns back, for medieval Latin is rich in interest to the student of language and literature. What he needs is a guide, *doctus sermones utriusque linguae*, who will explain the peculiar development of the language in the post-classical era and show that this unclassical literature is not without its own standards and values. It is as such a guide that Dr. R. A. Browne offers himself in the well-planned and scholarly book of British Latin selections which is the subject of this notice.

To make a short representative selection from the overwhelming mass of medieval Latin seems an impossible task: it will be the merest fraction of immensity, *nec tota pars, homo terrai quota totius unus*. Dr. Browne has narrowed the choice by restricting himself for the most part to British Latin authors, and has limited it still further by excluding technical documents and drawing only from *belles-lettres*. He thus presents a group of characteristic specimens which he hopes will stimulate his readers to investigate more widely and will at the same time give an idea of the wealth of British literature composed in Latin. And because most of us will have been classically trained, he lays great emphasis on the language and everywhere draws special attention to the non-classical aspects of medieval Latin. The book consists, then, of an introduction designed as a general survey of the language, and of eighty-four passages, many in prose but some in verse, each with a paragraph putting the author in his historical and literary context, followed by a bibliographical note and annotations on the less common usages. A very welcome addition is a vocabulary of medieval words.

The introduction seems to me excellent for its purpose. It first gives an account of the influences which in the post-classical period helped to create new word-formations. Then comes a section on medieval Latin syntax—a most informative section which should be in the hands of every prospective student. Next it deals with Latin word-accent, giving a concise history of the revolutionary change in the pronunciation of Latin when quantity was waning and stress-accent was gaining ground, and showing how this process af-

fected the rhythmical structure of prose and the metrical structure of verse. This leads naturally to the *cursum curiae Romanae* in prose and to the new accentual rhythm in verse, with some account of the origin and development of rhyme patterns. The last part treats of the prose style (or styles) of medieval Latin, and concludes with some remarks, and warnings, about pronunciation. The general observations in the introduction are well illustrated and reinforced by the notes attached to the text.

The extracts (which, it should be said, are taken mostly from printed and easily accessible sources) make up an attractively varied anthology. In prose, as might be expected, history predominates: but there are also examples of correspondence and biography and of writings on education, theology, philosophy, and science; and the verse passages also are varied in matter and kind. I do not suppose that any classical reader would ever admit in his heart that medieval literature is better than his own, or as good. But Dr. Browne has produced an alluring selection which is well worth reading for its intrinsic interest and as an indication of the diverse abundance that remains.

One final remark. A book so well appointed as this can never be cheap to publish: but at thirty-two shillings does it not price itself out of the range of the university student who needs it most?

W. H. SEMPLE

University of Manchester

REVILO PENDLETON OLIVER: *Niccolo Perotti's Version of the Enchiridion of Epictetus*. Pp. ix+166. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1954. Cloth, \$4.

EDITORS of Epictetus' *Enchiridion* will have to evaluate the Greek source represented by the pioneer Latin version of this classic of Stoicism. Students of cultural history will appreciate Mr. Oliver's lively account of Niccolo Perotti's life and work (pp. 1-34), to which are appended two letters to Pope Nicholas V's secretary Tortelli and a thirty-page provisional list of Perotti's writings. Amateurs of ecdotics must admire the minute and zestful diligence lavished on this *editio princeps*. To constitute his text Oliver has collated twelve manuscripts, ten of which he finds to be independent witnesses, the most valuable, *F*, being perhaps an author's revised holograph. The stemma assumes the loss of seven ancestors at various points, eight if an intermediary must be assumed

between *V* and *L*. Three *codices*, *MPT*, are by the same hand, *P* and *T* being copied after oral contamination of the antigraph. Oliver's introduction shows more interest in orthographic details than in data critical for stemmatics, but his apparatus bears out his affiliations.

A second apparatus gives the current Greek texts of Simplicius' Introduction and the *Enchiridion*, with manuscript variants relevant to Perotti's translation, and Oliver's comments on features that may be inferred in the Greek *codex* from which he translated. This is closest (p. 70) to Schweighäuser's *Pa* (Paris. gr. 1959, which, I note, H. Omont's catalogue ascribes to the century after Perotti). Oliver attempts no general conclusion, and an editor of the *Enchiridion* will be embarrassed at many points. Perotti makes mistakes in the meaning of particular words and forms, departs at places from the consensus of the Greek manuscripts, and arbitrarily omits or adds. Yet at some places Oliver thinks his Greek *codex* had a good reading, e.g. at *Ench.* 6, where Perotti's *bono equi* represents *ἐνὶ ἴππου ἀγαθῶ*, where Upton made the correction *ἴππου* from Simplicius, practically all Epictetus' manuscripts having *ἴππῳ* (teste W. A. Oldfather: Loeb edition, ii. 488). Now Oliver allows, at another point in this very paragraph, and elsewhere, that Perotti drew on Simplicius' commentary: if so, perhaps here, making it hazardous to claim for *ἴππου* the authority of his lost Greek *codex*. Again, in Simplicius' Introduction, 5b, Oliver argues (pp. 77-78) that Perotti's *codex* must have had the name of Epictetus, which Schweighäuser restored by conjecture, because the subject of the previous sentence is Socrates, and Perotti must have taken the pronoun *ὅς* as referring to Socrates. But already at 2c and later at 5c Perotti would have found the relevant doctrine, that man is a rational soul, ascribed to Epictetus, who is the main subject of the whole context. It was as easy for him as for Schweighäuser to grasp that Epictetus was meant.

The use made by Politian and Beroaldo (pp. 108-9) of Perotti's version is among many interesting matters arising *obiter* in this erudite book.

D. C. C. YOUNG

University of St. Andrews

University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1954. Cloth, 60s. net.

THIS is an elaborate edition of a single sheet—sixty lines—of papyrus (P. Col. 123) containing fourteen ἀποκρίματα—or rather excerpts from them—given in Alexandria in A.D. 200 by Septimius Severus. The excerpts are all very brief, and, in so far as they can be interpreted with any certainty at all, deal with a wide variety of topics, civil, criminal, and administrative. Where the document was found and why it was made is quite uncertain. Sir Harold Bell, who purchased it, along with fifty-six others, in 1930, conjectured that it was found in the Fayûm, and Professor Schiller suggests that it was prepared by a notary for his own use, as an example of the forms used in the Imperial Chancery. Even for this purpose some of the extracts are curiously brief (e.g. τοῖς ἐγγυαμένοις πλεόνθει), but it is certainly difficult to see what other purpose such a laconic and varied collection could have served.

The book is in effect two books. The late Professor Westermann edited and translated the text, and added a few pages of 'historical analysis' of each decision. Schiller accepts his colleague's reading of the text, but otherwise goes his own way, providing his own translation and an extensive 'legal commentary'. In his prefatory note Schiller says that 'one cannot be dogmatic about the nature of any of these terse replies . . . there are always a number of possible inferences'. With this one must agree, but why should it follow that 'no attempt has been made to reconcile views expressed in different parts of this volume'? The result, at any rate, is rather bewildering. The translations frequently differ, and even more frequently the interpretations. On one occasion the translations are diametrically opposed and yet the interpretations are (impossibly) the same: women, the excerpt declares, are not forbidden to borrow money or ὑπὲρ ἄλλον ἐκτείνειν; for Westermann this means 'exact payment' and for Schiller 'pay', but by both it is related to the *S.C. Vellaeianum*. Again, the first excerpt is said by Westermann to be addressed to an official and by Schiller to be necessarily, in common with all the others, addressed to a private petitioner. In the penultimate excerpt, Westermann declares that there had been a *cessio bonorum*, his colleague equally emphatically says not. And there are a great many other instances. Certainly there is often room for difference of opinion (though in the cases mentioned—and in others—Schiller seems clearly right), but can one not reasonably

*Apokrimata: Decisions of Septimius Severus on Legal Matters.* Edited by WILLIAM LINN WESTERMANN and A. ARTHUR SCHILLER. Pp. x+110; 1 plate. New York: Columbia

expect one editor at least to take account of his colleague's interpretation in arriving at his own? This is a courtesy—to the reader, if not to the other interpreter—which is usually extended even where the interpretations are not jointly published. In general, Schiller's interpretations are interesting and ingenious, and it may seem ungrateful to say that the foundations are, in isolation, usually too flimsy for such an elaborate structure.

BARRY NICHOLAS

Brasenose College, Oxford

EUGÈNE DROULERS: *Précis de mythologie grecque et de mythologie romaine*. Pp. 110; illus. Namur: Wesmael-Charlier, [1954]. Paper.

It is to be hoped that those Belgian readers 'qui désirent s'initier quelque peu aux "mystères" de la mythologie classique' (Preface) will find a better handbook than this little volume, much of which reads as if it had been written a century ago. The author, by his own account, 'a tâché d'être à la fois concis et précis', and credit must be given him for his good intentions, but he has failed, at all events in the second part of his task. Some influence of modern researches is apparent; for instance he knows (Preface) that Greek and Roman divinities who became identified are nevertheless not identical, and that Apollo (p. 34) was not a sun-god, though why he is styled 'dieu de la chasse' remains something of a puzzle: 'dieu de l'élevage' would be defensible as giving a perhaps correct account of his original nature. But against this must be set such antiquated ideas as that Kronos is Time (Plate II), that Pandora brought with her 'un petit vase fermé—présent de Zeus' (p. 13), that the gods 'ne peuvent échapper au Fatum' (p. 17; why the Latin name?), that Hephaistos may be the same as Tubalcain (p. 27), that Dionysos is simply wine personified (p. 50) and identical with Iakchos (p. 40). One would like to know the evidence for the statement that the cult of Eros was 'souvent souillé de désordres' (p. 45). It hardly existed outside of Thespiai. On p. 92 we have, second-hand, a joke of Ovid's (*Fast.* v. 673 ff.), taken most seriously. The next page treats Venus as if she had always been identical with Aphrodite and says not a word about her origins as a goddess of market-gardeners, and the next again identifies Diana with Iana (Luna), a recent divagation to match the old ones. But the worst feature is the constant failure to differentiate be-

tween mythology and religion. The plates are mostly quite worthless.

H. J. ROSE

St. Andrews

W. DEONNA: *Deux études de symbolisme religieux*. Pp. 123; 10 plates. Brussels: Latomus, 1955. Paper, 175 b.fr.

THIS pleasantly written and tolerably printed book consists of two essays, each designed to prove that something at first sight purely secular is closely connected with ritual. The first is called 'La légende de Pero et de Micon et l'allaitement symbolique'. The legend in question, pretty well known from the first Christian century onwards, selects for its title two of the many names applied to the good daughter who fed her starving father (or mother) with her own breast-milk and to the parent so relieved. Now the author proceeds to cite two series of undoubted facts; first, that Herakles allegedly was suckled by Hera either in infancy or when mature and already an inhabitant of heaven, and that the enmity between them therefore ceased, and second, that there is clear, if rather miscellaneous, evidence of an initiand undergoing, really or fictitiously, the same experience at the breast of a goddess, an idea so manifestly acceptable that it survives into the miracles of the B.V.M. He then derives the tale of Pero, or whatever we please to call her, from this ritual proceeding. I do not find that he adduces any other proof of this assertion than the dogma of Saintyves (p. 32 and n. 4) that most folktales spring from ritual. The answer is that most folktales proper, *Märchen*, do nothing of the kind and especially that moral anecdotes have their place among them. Much harm has been wrought by confusing *Märchen* with myth and with saga.

The second and longer essay is entitled 'L'aigle et le bijou. A propos du collier d'Harmonie décrit par Nonnos'. Nonnos, *Dion.* v. 145-89, describes at his usual wearisome length this famous object, which according to him consisted of an elaborately decorated two-headed snake and a clasp in the shape of an eagle with outspread wings. Now follows a long series of references to art-monuments of various kinds, mostly not Greek and many Egyptian, as Nonnos was, which have this or a like motif. Many, according to Deonna practically all, these eagles and serpents have a magico-religious significance. The upshot of the argument is that it was from the magico-religious sphere



that Nonnos got his details. Again, I can see nothing like proof, no bar to supposing that he simply combined two motifs well known to workers in the precious metals; and a further objection is the question why this verbose and episodic author never hints that any part of the necklace had any other function than ornament.

In the text and notes there is a good deal of information to be picked up by those who attend to it and not to the thread of argument. There are also some annoying little errors. P. 6, of course Valerius Maximus was not so ignorant of Greek as to call the heroine Perus. He has her name in the genitive, quite correctly formed. P. 7, line 1, the mention of Hyginus contradicts the correct statement regarding him in p. 6, n. 2. P. 21, Galen as quoted in n. 7 seems to be recommending breast-milk, not for *les vieillards débilisés*, but for premature old age. P. 29, n. 3, why quote a seventeenth-century writer for Manilius' famous tag *nascens morimur*, etc., and not Manilius himself? P. 47, I fail to see any resemblance between the cruelly bad luck, *fortuna iniqua*, which overtook Pero's parent, and the relations between Pietas and Fortuna in cult. P. 52, no. 1, five minutes' examination of the Loeb Nonnos would have shown Deonna that I wrote neither all the introduction nor all the notes. P. 117, I flatly deny that Nonnos can by any possibility have written the *Dionysiaca* after his conversion.

H. J. ROSE

University of St. Andrews

back. The ground-floor rooms were mostly taverns, each with its own indoor well and outdoor latrine. The upstairs rooms were presumably bedrooms.

When Corinth was re-established in 44 B.C., the front of the Stoa was still in fair condition. But the back had probably suffered, and the ground-floor rooms were gradually replaced by offices, baths, etc., of differing plan, while the road from Cenchræe was brought in through the middle. If the upper floor survived, it was very soon demolished and with it the northern slope of the roof; the new and presumably the remaining old rooms of the ground floor were separately roofed. Finally, like so much else at Corinth, the South Stoa was wrecked by the Herulians in 267 and never restored.

Broneer's publication is detailed and competent, presenting the evidence clearly and reasoning honestly, and so enabling the reader to disagree with this or that interpretation or restoration. But there is little to criticize. P. 61: the argument that the wells were for refrigeration is not conclusive. Pp. 98-99: it is hardly credible that the upper floor, directly above a row of taverns, was intended to accommodate official delegates to the Corinthian League. Pp. 29 and 44. 1 are amusing examples of photographic correction. Plan 22 and p. 106: can the 'fifth animal' of the top left perhaps be the body of the bovine held down by the leopard?

R. M. COOK

Museum of Classical Archaeology,  
Cambridge

OSCAR BRONEER: *Corinth*. Vol. I, Part IV: *The South Stoa*. Pp. xviii + 167; 56 plates, 67 figs., 22 plans. Princeton, N.J.: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1954. Cloth, \$15.00.

THE South Stoa at Corinth was built soon after the middle of the fourth century B.C. as the upper boundary to an extension of the Agora. Architecturally it is of good quality and unusual interest. Nearly 165 metres long, it had like many other stoas an outer Doric and an inner Ionic colonnade and behind them a row of enclosed rooms (divided into a front and back compartment). But these rooms extended forward as far as the line of the ridge and there was above them a second story, reached by a staircase at either end. The arrangement of this upper story is uncertain: the rooms must have opened off a corridor and there were probably windows onto the colonnade and in a clerestory at the

ARTHUR E. GORDON: *Potitus Valerius Messalla, Consul Suffect 29 B.C.* (Publications in Classical Archaeology, Volume 3, No. 2.) Pp. 34, 3 plates. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1954. Paper, 50 c.

THIS monograph is the result of a re-examination of the fragmentary funeral inscription of Potitus Valerius Messalla, *cos. suff.* 29 B.C. (*C.I.L.* vi. 37075 = *I.L.S.* 8964). Much evidence is assembled about this Messalla, whose identity has been disputed in the past owing to the omission of his name from the *Fasti Venusini* under the year 29 B.C., and to the variations in ancient practice over his nomenclature. The *Fasti Magistrorum Vici* confirmed Dio's notice (li. 21. 1-2) of his suffect consulship and added to the

other Roman evidence which showed that Potitus was his praenomen and not (as it appeared from two inscriptions in Asia, from Pliny, and from Dio) a cognomen, and therefore that he must be firmly distinguished from the various contemporary M. Valerii Messallae. After this restatement of the problems and the evidence there should be no further confusion.

After reaffirming the identity of the subject, Gordon proceeds to the text and discusses at considerable length possible restorations of the broken lines. Previous publications have been unsatisfactory epigraphically, supplements being proposed without much regard to the probable size of the inscribed panel and the layout, about which reasonable conjectures can be, and are here, made. By no means all the points put forward in the course of this discussion as directly or indirectly relevant seem worth printing; but the eventual result is a useful advance. Secure conclusions are out of the question, but the restorations tentatively proposed (beautifully drawn by Mrs. Gordon) indicate what are the epigraphic possibilities and so what are the limits to what the historian may conjecture about such aspects of this man's career as were recorded on his tombstone. On a very minor point, l. 2 in the drawing seems cramped—it might be better to read TR·MIL for TRIB·MIL.

J. M. REYNOLDS

Newnham College, Cambridge

*Opuscula Romana*: Vol. i. (Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Rom, 4<sup>o</sup>, xviii.) Pp. 231; 13 plates, 75 figs. Lund: Gleerup, 1954. Paper.

THIS is a volume dedicated to Axel Boethius, first director of the Swedish Institute in Rome, and it covers a very wide field of subjects. The reviewer can only follow personal interests in selecting papers for comment.

The majority of papers are archaeological, three concerned with material from the city of Rome, two from Italy, and two from Roman provinces. E. Gjerstad reconsiders the question of Rome's early fortifications in the context of recent discoveries about the development of isolated hill-top settlements to synoecized city. His useful realignment of the problems is followed by an important re-examination of the stone walls which have been attributed to Servius Tullius but which are, in his view, considerably later. E. Welin seeks to define the area of the Campus

Martius and to fix the location of the Ara Martis, and uses shrewd argument, drawn from a ranging variety of evidence, but does not accompany it with the maps without which it cannot be effectively understood. B. E. Thomasson edits 47 unpublished inscriptions found shortly after the First World War in a cemetery on the Via Ostiensis. Individually they are of restricted interest (although it is a pity that no. 102, which refers to architectural and decorative features, seems not to be associable with anything found by the excavators), but from their cumulative evidence the author describes the society served by the cemetery in the second and third centuries A.D.—and, as in contemporary cemeteries like that under St. Peter's, it consisted largely of families of slave origin with roots in the Eastern Mediterranean. A. Andrén offers a preliminary account of his small excavation on the Acropolis at Ardea. Å. Åkerström discusses the affinities in style and subject-matter of Etruscan terracotta friezes. O. Vessberg collects Roman portraits found in Cyprus, including one very fine new head which he proposes to identify as Gaius. E. Sjöquist gives an account of the purpose and form of the buildings called Caesarea at Alexandria, Antioch, and Cyrene and traces the development of the architectural type. The part assigned to Caesar in this development and in its transplantation to Italy from Egypt, where, he shows, it was devised to meet the needs of the Ptolemaic ruler-cult, is relevant to the assessment of Caesar's ambitions. The studies of particular Caesarea are most stimulating, but there are a number of points requiring reconsideration in that on the one at Cyrene. Sjöquist has been mistaken in his citation of the inscriptions: *C.I.L.* iii. 10, from a reading, certainly correct, made when the stone was undamaged, is a much better text than he quotes for the inscription from the South entrance; and the inscription that he gives as from the East Gate is in fact from the Strategeion. The relevant Caesareum inscription records a rebuilding by M. Sufenas Proculus, who also rebuilt the Strategeion, but the argument for the date of the Strategeion text does not apply in detail to the Caesareum. Further, since he would like to assimilate the Cyrene Caesareum to those at Alexandria and Antioch in form and original purpose, he argues that the adjacent basilica was a later addition to it and suggests that it is likely to have been built in honour of Caesar, although doubtless later used for the imperial cult in general. On the former point, none of his arguments is quite conclusive, and, incidentally, he

seems unaware that the Hadrianic inscription from the basilica is cut over an erased text; a verdict must await the publication of work on the site undertaken by the British School at Rome in the summer of 1955: on the latter, it is to be remembered that *C.I.L.* ix. 1556 records an example of a *Caesareum* (at Beneventum) built in honour of Augustus.

In addition to the archaeological articles, S. Svennung brings common sense to bear on the circumstances described in Catullus 4; K. Hanell and H. Thylander examine the Roman system of nomenclature, the former as it appears in Polybius, the latter in Cicero's Letters to Atticus. Polybius gives a clearer result, a valuable insight into the development of the cognomen; Cicero's informality makes precise conclusions more difficult, but it might be held that a closer consideration of the practices of irony would have clarified discussion of the respect and courtesy normally implied in the use of the *praenomen-nomen*. Finally M. P. Nilsson discusses illuminatingly the differences in character and history of domestic cults in Greece and Italy; and there are two papers on later Italian subjects—R. Billig on Die Kirchenplane "al modo antico" von Sebastiano Serlio and C. Callmer on Flavio Biondo.

J. M. REYNOLDS

Newnham College, Cambridge

W. VOLLGRAFF: *Une inscription gravée sur un vase cultuel mithraïque*. (Med. der K. Nederlandse Akad. van Wetenschappen, afd. Letterkunde, N.R. 18, 8.) Pp. 14. Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing Co., 1955. Paper, fl. 1.25.

The vessel in question is a roughly cylindrical affair, found inside a *dolium* sunk in the earth in the Mithreum of S. Prisca on the Aventine. It was published in 1941 by Father A. Ferrua (*Bull. della comm. arch. de Roma*, lxviii. 89, fig. 15), who could not make out the inscription. Vollgraff, after examining sundry squeezes and copies 'aimablement mis à ma disposition' (p. 2/206), transcribes the none too legible letters thus: *Te cauterio. i, Saturne, i, Ata[r, i] Opi*. The first two words refer to the branding of Mithraic initiates, a practice mentioned more or less convincingly by a number of late authors, both pagan and Christian. Of the deities invoked, Atar is the Persian fire-god, Saturnus is Kronos-Zrvan Akarana, or so it would appear; Opos or Opis is Rhea-Anaitis. The verb *i* here means *ueni*,

a signification attested by Donatus on Ter. *Ad.* 361, and indeed by the text of Terence himself (*sed ecum Syrum ire uideo*; Syrus is entering, not going away).

Like other researches of this scholar, the present one contains debatable conjectures and interpretations which may be disputed, but of its interest there can be no doubt, at all events.

H. J. ROSE

St. Andrews

*Dumbarton Oaks Papers*. Number 8. Pp. 330; 42 plates. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1954. Cloth, 60s. net.

THE eighth volume of *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* keeps up the high standards of scholarship and production of its predecessors. It is dedicated to the memory of Robert Pierpont Blake and includes a memoir emphasizing the importance of his work for Caucasian studies and a bibliography of his writings. The two longest and most important articles in the volume are a valuable study by Ernst Kitzinger of the growth of the cult of images in the period between Justinian and the outbreak of Iconoclasm and a thorough study by Robert Lee Wolff of the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople under the Latin Emperors. It also includes an interesting study by R. J. H. Jenkins on the *Vita Basilii* of Constantine Porphyrogenitus and a suggestive account of the historical evidence to be drawn from the copying of classical manuscripts during the period between Photius and Constantine Porphyrogenitus contributed by Alphonse Dain. There are two historico-philosophical articles, one by William Banner on Origen and Natural Law, and the other by Milton Anastos on the ethical theories of the Iconoclasts. The art-historical articles consist of one by André Grabar on a Constantinopolitan liturgical Roll now at Jerusalem, which he dates about the close of the eleventh century, and a shorter note, also by Grabar, on an enamel reliquary of Saint Demetrius in the *Dumbarton Oaks Collection*, to which he gives a thirteenth-century or later date; and a study by Albert Jamme on a Sabaeon bronze horse of the late fourth or early fifth century in the same collection. There is also an interesting note by Sirarpie der Nersessian on the Armenian version of the Harrowing of Hell, based on a thirteenth-century manuscript which she discovered at Jerusalem. The plates illustrating these articles are, as usual,



pronounced in each country, after the Reformation as before it, on the same principles as the vernacular, and until about the middle of last century the regular liturgical practice in England, among Protestants and Roman Catholics alike, was to give the consonants their current English values and the vowels *a*, *e*, *i*, and *u* the values which were general in earlier English and are maintained in

many words in current English. Among the new material used in this second edition is a rare broadsheet of 1582 in which a French priest violently denounces those innovators who are trying to introduce into France a new pronunciation which his description clearly shows to be the Italian, and confounds them with such ingenious texts as 2 Kings xvii. 26 and Nehemiah viii. 8.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

EOS

XLVI (1952-1953): ZESZYT 2  
[published 1955]

J. Lachs, *The Minera's of Dioscurides*: D.'s work is a contribution to mineraology as much as to medicine. H. Szelest, *The History of Herodian*: though closer to the historical novel than to history or biography, it is not without historical value. J. Wikarjak, *Greek Personal Names*, shows how they reflect social conditions. J. Safarewicz, *Latin at the Decline of the Republic*: the settlement of veterans established Latin in the peninsula and so made dialect a sign of social inferiority (*rusticitas*); while in the literary language the innovations of the *rescriptores*, though owing much to cultured colloquialism, prepared the way for the final breach between literary and colloquial Latin. I. Kazik-Zawadzka, *New Researches on Latin*, summaries with comments the contents of *R.E.L.* and *Glossa* 1948-52. I. Kotula, *Latifundia in Africa in the Early Empire*, illustrates with a map the growth of imperial and private estates in Mauretania, Numidia, and Africa Proconsularis. [All articles are in Polish.]

and Appian; Dio attempts to reconcile both dates by assuming that a compact formed in 60 was kept secret until 59. E. Wüst, *Hektor und Polydamas*: the dispute between Hector and Polydamas is the conflict of State and Religion that recurs in Homer (e.g. Agamemnon and Calchas), legend (e.g. the death of Neoptolemus, the introduction of the cult of Dionysus), and history (e.g. prosecutions for impiety in Periclean Athens). M. Mühl, *Solon und der Historiker Phainias von Lesbos*: Solon's secret promises (Phainias of Lesbos in *Plut. Sol.* 14) are an invention to reconcile the *οὐκοῦν* with the Archon's oath of Arist. *A.P.* 56. 2; but this oath is post-Solonian. H. Volkmann, *Die indirekte Erzählung bei Diodor*: a third of the contents of Books i-v is in *O.O.*; this is due partly to the influence of Diodorus' sources which claimed to be reporting original documents, and partly to Diodorus' wish to distinguish mythology, for which he could not accept reasonableness, from history. A. Klata, *Die Kämpfe Roms mit den Carthaginiern*: *Livius*: the numbers given for men of military age in 208, 207, 206, 205, 204, 203, 202, 201, 200, 199, 198, 197, 196, 195, 194, 193, 192, 191, 190, 189, 188, 187, 186, 185, 184, 183, 182, 181, 180, 179, 178, 177, 176, 175, 174, 173, 172, 171, 170, 169, 168, 167, 166, 165, 164, 163, 162, 161, 160, 159, 158, 157, 156, 155, 154, 153, 152, 151, 150, 149, 148, 147, 146, 145, 144, 143, 142, 141, 140, 139, 138, 137, 136, 135, 134, 133, 132, 131, 130, 129, 128, 127, 126, 125, 124, 123, 122, 121, 120, 119, 118, 117, 116, 115, 114, 113, 112, 111, 110, 109, 108, 107, 106, 105, 104, 103, 102, 101, 100, 99, 98, 97, 96, 95, 94, 93, 92, 91, 90, 89, 88, 87, 86, 85, 84, 83, 82, 81, 80, 79, 78, 77, 76, 75, 74, 73, 72, 71, 70, 69, 68, 67, 66, 65, 64, 63, 62, 61, 60, 59, 58, 57, 56, 55, 54, 53, 52, 51, 50, 49, 48, 47, 46, 45, 44, 43, 42, 41, 40, 39, 38, 37, 36, 35, 34, 33, 32, 31, 30, 29, 28, 27, 26, 25, 24, 23, 22, 21, 20, 19, 18, 17, 16, 15, 14, 13, 12, 11, 10, 9, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1, 0.

other Roman evidence which showed that Potitus was his praenomen and not (as it appeared from two inscriptions in Asia, from Pliny, and from Dio) a cognomen, and therefore that he must be firmly distinguished from the various contemporary M. Valerii Messallae. After this restatement of the problems and the evidence there should be no further confusion.

After reaffirming the identity of the subject, Gordon proceeds to the text and discusses at considerable length possible restorations of the broken lines. Previous publications have been unsatisfactory epigraphically, supplements being proposed without much regard to the probable size of the inscribed panel and the layout, about which reasonable conjectures can be, and are here, made. By no means all the points put forward in the course of this discussion as directly or indirectly relevant seem worth printing; but the eventual result is a useful advance. Secure conclusions are out of the question, but the restorations tentatively proposed (beautifully drawn by Mrs. Gordon) indicate what are the epigraphic possibilities and so what are the limits to what the historian may conjecture about such aspects of this man's career as were recorded on his tombstone. On a very minor point, l. 2 in the drawing seems cramped—it might be better to read TR · MIL for TRIB · MIL.

J. M. REYNOLDS

Newnham College, Cambridge

*Opuscula Romana*: Vol. i. (Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Rom, 4°, xviii.) Pp. 231; 13 plates, 75 figs. Lund: Gleerup, 1954. Paper.

THIS is a volume dedicated to Axel Boethius, first director of the Swedish Institute in Rome, and it covers a very wide field of subjects. The reviewer can only follow personal interests in selecting papers for comment.

The majority of papers are archaeological, three concerned with material from the city of Rome, two from Italy, and two from Roman provinces. E. Gjerstad reconsiders the question of Rome's early fortifications in the context of recent discoveries about the development of isolated hill-top settlements to synoecized city. His useful realignment of the problems is followed by an important re-examination of the stone walls which have been attributed to Servius Tullius but which are, in his view, considerably later. E. Welin seeks to define the area of the Campus

Martius and to fix the location of the Ara Martis, and uses shrewd argument, drawn from a ranging variety of evidence, but does not accompany it with the maps without which it cannot be effectively understood. B. E. Thomasson edits 47 unpublished inscriptions found shortly after the First World War in a cemetery on the Via Ostiensis. Individually they are of restricted interest (although it is a pity that no. 102, which refers to architectural and decorative features, seems not to be associable with anything found by the excavators), but from their cumulative evidence the author describes the society served by the cemetery in the second and third centuries A.D.—and, as in contemporary cemeteries like that under St. Peter's, it consisted largely of families of slave origin with roots in the Eastern Mediterranean. A. Andrén offers a preliminary account of his small excavation on the Acropolis at Ardea. Å. Åkerström discusses the affinities in style and subject-matter of Etruscan terracotta friezes. O. Vessberg collects Roman portraits found in Cyprus, including one very fine new head which he proposes to identify as Gaius. E. Sjöquist gives an account of the purpose and form of the buildings called Caesarea at Alexandria, Antioch, and Cyrene and traces the development of the architectural type. The part assigned to Caesar in this development and in its transplantation to Italy from Egypt, where, he shows, it was devised to meet the needs of the Ptolemaic ruler-cult, is relevant to the assessment of Caesar's ambitions. The studies of particular Caesarea are most stimulating, but there are a number of points requiring reconsideration in that on the one at Cyrene. Sjöquist has been mistaken in his citation of the inscriptions: *C.I.L.* iii. 10, from a reading, certainly correct, made when the stone was undamaged, is a much better text than he quotes for the inscription from the South entrance; and the inscription that he gives as from the East Gate is in fact from the Strategeion. The relevant Caesareum inscription records a rebuilding by M. Sufenas Proculus, who also rebuilt the Strategeion, but the argument for the date of the Strategeion text does not apply in detail to the Caesareum. Further, since he would like to assimilate the Cyrene Caesareum to those at Alexandria and Antioch in form and original purpose, he argues that the adjacent basilica was a later addition to it and suggests that it is likely to have been built in honour of Caesar, although doubtless later used for the imperial cult in general. On the former point, none of his arguments is quite conclusive, and, incidentally, he



seems unaware that the Hadrianic inscription from the basilica is cut over an erased text; a verdict must await the publication of work on the site undertaken by the British School at Rome in the summer of 1955: on the latter, it is to be remembered that *C.I.L.* ix. 1556 records an example of a Caesareum (at Beneventum) built in honour of Augustus.

In addition to the archaeological articles, S. Svennung brings common sense to bear on the circumstances described in Catullus 4; K. Hanell and H. Thylander examine the Roman system of nomenclature, the former as it appears in Polybius, the latter in Cicero's Letters to Atticus. Polybius gives a clearer result, a valuable insight into the development of the cognomen; Cicero's informality makes precise conclusions more difficult, but it might be held that a closer consideration of the practices of irony would have clarified discussion of the respect and courtesy normally implied in the use of the praenomen-nomen. Finally M. P. Nilsson discusses illuminatingly the differences in character and history of domestic cults in Greece and Italy; and there are two papers on later Italian subjects—R. Billig on Die Kirchenplane "al modo antico" von Sebastiano Serlio and C. Callmer on Flavio Biondo.

J. M. REYNOLDS

Neunham College, Cambridge

W. VOLLGRAFF: *Une inscription gravée sur un vase cultuel mithraïque*. (Med. der K. Nederlandse Akad. van Wetenschappen, afd. Letterkunde, N.R. 18, 8.) Pp. 14. Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing Co., 1955. Paper, fl. 1.25.

THE vessel in question is a roughly cylindrical affair, found inside a *dolium* sunk in the earth in the Mithreum of S. Prisca on the Aventine. It was published in 1941 by Father A. Ferrua (*Bull. della comm. arch. de Roma*, lxviii. 89, fig. 15), who could not make out the inscription. Vollgraff, after examining sundry squeezes and copies 'aimablement mis à ma disposition' (p. 2/206), transcribes the none too legible letters thus: *Te cauterio. i, Saturne, i, Ata[r, i] Opi*. The first two words refer to the branding of Mithraic initiates, a practice mentioned more or less convincingly by a number of late authors, both pagan and Christian. Of the deities invoked, Atar is the Persian fire-god, Saturnus is Kronos-Zrvan Akarana, or so it would appear; Ops or Opis is Rhea-Anaitis. The verb *i* here means *ueni*,

a signification attested by Donatus on Ter. *Ad.* 361, and indeed by the text of Terence himself (*sed ecum Syrum ire uideo*; Syrus is entering, not going away).

Like other researches of this scholar, the present one contains debatable conjectures and interpretations which may be disputed, but of its interest there can be no doubt, at all events.

H. J. ROSE

St. Andrews

*Dumbarton Oaks Papers*. Number 8. Pp. 330; 42 plates. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1954. Cloth, 60s. net.

THE eighth volume of *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* keeps up the high standards of scholarship and production of its predecessors. It is dedicated to the memory of Robert Pierpont Blake and includes a memoir emphasizing the importance of his work for Caucasian studies and a bibliography of his writings. The two longest and most important articles in the volume are a valuable study by Ernst Kitzinger of the growth of the cult of images in the period between Justinian and the outbreak of Iconoclasm and a thorough study by Robert Lee Wolff of the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople under the Latin Emperors. It also includes an interesting study by R. J. H. Jenkins on the *Vita Basilii* of Constantine Porphyrogenitus and a suggestive account of the historical evidence to be drawn from the copying of classical manuscripts during the period between Photius and Constantine Porphyrogenitus contributed by Alphonse Dain. There are two historico-philosophical articles, one by William Banner on Origen and Natural Law, and the other by Milton Anastos on the ethical theories of the Iconoclasts. The art-historical articles consist of one by André Grabar on a Constantinopolitan liturgical Roll now at Jerusalem, which he dates about the close of the eleventh century, and a shorter note, also by Grabar, on an enamel reliquary of Saint Demetrius in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection, to which he gives a thirteenth-century or later date; and a study by Albert Jamme on a Sabaeon bronze horse of the late fourth or early fifth century in the same collection. There is also an interesting note by Sirarpie der Nersessian on the Armenian version of the Harrowing of Hell, based on a thirteenth-century manuscript which she discovered at Jerusalem. The plates illustrating these articles are, as usual,

admirably produced; and the whole volume forms a useful addition to Byzantine studies.

STEVEN RUNCIMAN

M. SANDMANN: *Subject and Predicate*. Pp. xiv+270. Edinburgh: University Press, 1954. Cloth, 25s. net.

THIS complex book is an attack on the question of 'what—if any—is the usefulness of the terms S(ubject) and P(redicate) for the grammarian' (p. 2), a question to which the answer, in Sandmann's opinion, requires a review of the general aspects of linguistic structure in relation to the 'ideal structures' of cognition or thought, and of representation. It is emphasized that, notwithstanding the philosophical character of much of the book, the problem is approached from the linguistic standpoint. Sandmann does not, however, claim to set up universally valid categories of linguistic analysis and description, and explicitly limits his investigation to the grammar of a few modern European languages of Indo-European stock, with a few references to Latin and fewer to Greek.

Since the origin of the terms Subject and Predicate belongs to logic, not grammar, and since modern logicians, psychologists, and linguists alike have been inclined to repudiate them as the property of one of the other sciences, Sandmann holds that 'the legitimacy of S and P can only be discussed within the framework of a study of the relationship between "thought", or rather "cognition", and "language"' (p. 2). Hence a tripartite division of the work: Part i is concerned with the demarcation of the three sciences of logic, psychology, and linguistic; Part ii describes the role attributed to Subject and Predicate in the sciences of thought and of language respectively, and states a theory of the nature of the Subject-Predicate relation; Part iii investigates in turn representational, cognitional, and formulational grammar, and the 'integration' of the first of these into the second and of the resulting ideal grammar into the third. Formulational grammar consequently reflects in its forms the ideal structure of thought; but, since languages are social and historical products, the reflection is always inaccurate and incomplete. The volume ends with a long and interesting bibliography and indexes of names and subjects.

To the reviewer, at least, the most satisfactory part of Sandmann's thesis is that in which he maintains that the Subject-Predicate relation is an element of cognitional

grammar, reflected in linguistic forms only because the structures of thought and language are mutually involved; that it is a necessary form of the judgement, not of the linguistic expression of the judgement. The description of this relationship in terms of *prius* and *posterius logicum* seems, on the other hand, to be not in all respects valid in the form in which it is set out. Some uneasiness may be felt about the section of the book (Part iii, chapters iii-vii) which seeks to show 'how the possibilities inherent in the ideal forms of representation, space, time, and quality are utilized in linguistic constructions' (p. 194). That some of the arguments in this part are near to sophistry is evident from a number of passages, including a noteworthy specimen on page 170 ('When we say *iron is hard* . . . spatial continuum'). Subsidiary discussions of special interest include a useful distinction of derivation and transposition (pp. 199 ff.) and a valuable theory, put forward in opposition to Gardiner and others, of a type of emphatic sentence-stress which the author names 'pedagogical stress' (pp. 239 ff.).

In a short review it is impossible to give an adequate idea either of the general scope of this book or of the numerous detailed questions discussed, and it would be something of an impertinence to attempt to dispute so long-sustained an argument. Enough has been achieved if it is made clear that this book is no mere discussion of Subject-Predicate forms within the framework of traditional syntax nor of structural linguistic, but an attempt to track down the essence of the Subject-Predicate relationship itself and to hold a single line of reasoning through some 250 pages and many apparent side-issues. The number of its admirers will not be limited to those who agree with it.

D. M. JONES

Westfield College, London

F. BRITAIN: *Latin in Church*. The History of its Pronunciation. (Alcuin Club Tracts, xxviii.) Pp. 98. London: Mowbray, 1955. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.

THE reappearance of Dr. Britain's learned and lively book, first published in 1934, is welcome. His trenchant arguments demolish the notion that the 'Italian' pronunciation, which is favoured by many choirs today, has any length of tradition behind it in this country, or in any country outside Italy; ecclesiastical Latin, like secular Latin, was

pronounced in each country, after the Reformation as before it, on the same principles as the vernacular, and until about the middle of last century the regular liturgical practice in England, among Protestants and Roman Catholics alike, was to give the consonants their current English values and the vowels *a*, *ē*, *i*, and *ū* the values which were general in earlier English and are maintained in

many words in current English. Among the new material used in this second edition is a rare broadsheet of 1582 in which a French priest violently denounces those innovators who are trying to introduce into France a new pronunciation which his description clearly shows to be the Italian, and confounds them with such ingenious texts as 2 Kings xvii. 26 and Nehemiah viii. 8.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

EOS

XLVI (1952-1953): ZESZYT 2  
[published 1955]

J. Lachs, *The Minerals of Dioscurides*: D.'s work is a contribution to mineralogy as much as to medicine. H. Szelest, *The History of Herodian*: though closer to the historical novel than to history or biography, it is not without historical value. J. Wikarjak, *Greek Personal Names*, shows how they reflect social conditions. J. Safarewicz, *Latin at the Decline of the Republic*: the settlement of veterans established Latin in the peninsula and so made dialect a sign of social inferiority (*rusticitas*); while in the literary language the innovations of the *veterepikol*, though owing much to cultured colloquialism, prepared the way for the final breach between literary and colloquial Latin. I. Kazik-Zawadska, *New Researches on Latin*, summarizes with comment the contents of *R.E.L.* and *Glotta* 1948-52. T. Kotula, *Latifundia in Africa in the Early Empire*, illustrates with a map the growth of imperial and private estates in Mauretania, Numidia, and Africa Proconsularis. [All articles are in Polish.]

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM

XCVIII. 4: 1955

K. Büchner, *Tacitus und Plinius über Adoption des römischen Kaisers*: Plin. *Pan.* 7-8 imitates Tac. *H. i.* 15-16. W. G. Arnott, *A Note on Alexis' Opora*: the *Opora* of the scholiasts of Germanicus should be ascribed to Alexis. V. Pisani, *Der lat.-i-Genitiv und die faliskischen -asio-Bildungen*, maintains his identification of these forms. R. Hanslik, *Cicero und das erste Triumvirat*: contemporary evidence (Cicero and Atticus) shows that the First Triumvirate was formed in February 59; Asinius Pollio dated it in 60 for dramatic effect, and was followed by Livy, Plutarch, Suetonius,

and Appian; Dio attempts to reconcile both dates by assuming that a compact formed in 60 was kept secret until 59. E. Wüst, *Hektor und Polydamas*: the dispute between Hector and Polydamas is the conflict of State and Religion that recurs in Homer (e.g. Agamemnon and Calchas), legend (e.g. the death of Neoptolemus, the introduction of the cult of Dionysus), and history (e.g. prosecutions for impiety in Periclean Athens). M. Mühl, *Solon und der Historiker Phainias von Lesbos*: Solon's secret promises (Phainias of Lesbos in Plut. *Sol.* 14) are an invention to reconcile the *σειράχθεια* with the Archon's oath of Arist. *A.P.* 56. 2; but this oath is post-Solonian. H. Volkmann, *Die indirekte Erzählung bei Diodor*: a third of the contents of Books i-v is in *O.O.*: this is due partly to the influence of Diodorus' sources which claimed to be reporting original documents, and partly to Diodorus' wish to distinguish mythology, for which he could not accept responsibility, from history. A. Klotz, *Die Kämpfe Roms mit den Galliern nach Polybios und Livius*: the numbers given for men of military age in 225 may be accepted; for the period 387-223 there is no close agreement between the two traditions for the early decades. P. Maas, *Euripides Electra* 578: *πυκνότητες τοῖς οὐκ ἐπέκειμαι—σύγρον' ἃ χρόνῳ φάεσι*. E. Bickel, *'Kaiser' keltisch amherawdyr*: the Celtic word is derived from *imperator*; *Caesar* was not used for 'emperor' in the Middle Ages. A. Lumpe, *Solons Einfluß auf Xenophanes*: Xenophanes drew inspiration from Solon's poems.

RIVISTA DI FILOLOGIA E DI  
ISTRUZIONE CLASSICA

NEW SERIES XXXIII (1955), 4

(338) A. Pasoli, *de quadam ad Caesarem epistula quam Cicero numquam misit*: a study (in Latin) of certain passages in *ad Att.* xii and

xiii, referring to a letter which Cicero drafted in May 45 B.C., intending to send it to Caesar, but which on Atticus' advice he somewhat reluctantly suppressed; includes a full discussion of the *locus conclamatus*, ad Att. xiii. 31. 3. (361) Carla Schick, *Appunti per una storia della prosa greca — I. La lingua delle iscrizioni*: the first of a series of articles in which the author plans to discuss aspects of the historical evolution of Greek prose style; here she deals with the earlier inscriptions, concluding that 'the Dorians were the first to adopt in their inscriptions that cold, precise, official style which we are accustomed to regard as the technical chancery style; and it was probably from them that peoples of other (Greek) races learned it'. (391) G. Nenci, *Un prodigio dei signa nella battaglia di Ausculum e le origini di un topos fisiologico*: starting from two passages in Horapollo, *Hieroglyphica* ii. 85–86, in which the flight of an elephant at the sight of a ram, and again on hearing the voice of a boar, is said to typify

the king's avoidance of idiots and chatter-boxes respectively, Nenci argues (a) that the king must be Pyrrhus of Epirus, (b) that the ram and boar in question must be the badges of republican legions which put the elephants of Pyrrhus to flight, (c) that this must be a reference to the battle of Asculum, and (d) that the symbols on *aes graue* and on Romano-Campanian silver coins relate to this achievement too. (405) P. Frassinetti, *Note a Persio e Giovenale*: discusses three passages—(a) Pers. 1. 4–5, arguing that the omission of *Troas* from the imitation of *Il. xxii. 105* is to be explained as a portmanteau reference to the less usual version of the *ἑπλων κρίσις* which is to be found in the *Little Iliad* (fr. 2 Allen); (b) Pers. 5. 61, suggesting that the correct interpretation is 'And now, old and slow, they complain that life has been left to them (as too heavy a burden)'; (c) Juv. 9 *passim*, arguing that Naevolus is to be taken as a portrait of a contemporary *Stoicida* (cf. 2. 65). (415) Reviews. (445) Books received.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

*Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections are not included in this list unless they are also published separately.*

- Barker (E.) *From Alexander to Constantine. Passages and Documents illustrating the History of Social and Political Ideas, 336 B.C.–A.D. 337.* Pp. xxv + 505. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956. Cloth, 50s. net.
- Beaujeu (J.) *La religion romaine à l'apogée de l'Empire. I: La politique religieuse des Antonins (96–192).* Pp. 452; 5 plates. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1955. Paper, 2000 fr.
- Bennett (E. L.) *The Pylos Tablets: texts of the inscriptions found, 1939–1954.* Pp. xxxii + 252. Princeton: University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1956. Paper, 40s. net.
- Boak (A. E. R.) *Manpower Shortage and the Fall of the Roman Empire in the West.* Pp. vii + 169. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1955. Cloth, 36s. net.
- Botsford (G. W.), Robinson (C. A.) *Hellenic History.* Fourth edition. Pp. xxiii + 519; 110 plates, 63 maps and diagrams. New York and London: The Macmillan Company, 1956. Cloth, 47s. net.
- British School at Rome.* Papers, volume xxiii (New series, vol. x). Pp. viii + 203; 38 plates. London: British School at Rome, 1956. Cloth.
- Chibnall (M.) *The Historia Pontificalis of John of Salisbury.* Translated with introduction and notes. Pp. 1 + 109 (double). Edinburgh: Nelson, 1956. Cloth, 20s. net.
- Daniélou (J.) *Grégoire de Nysse: La Vie de Moïse.* Introduction, texte critique, et traduction. (Sources Chrétiennes, 1 bis.) Pp. xxxv + 155 (double). Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1955. Paper.
- Del Grande (C.) *Filologia Minore: Studi di Poesia e Storia nella Grecia Antica da Omero a Bisanzio.* Pp. 376. Naples: Ricciardi, 1956. Paper, L. 2,500.
- Desrousseaux (A. M.) *Athénée: Les Deipnosophistes, livres i et ii.* Texte établi et traduit. Pp. lxxii + 207 (double). Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1956. Paper, 1200 fr.
- de Schaetzen (P.) *Index des terminaisons des marques de potiers gallo-romains sur terra sigillata.* (Collection Latomus, xxiv.) Pp. 77. Brussels: Latomus, 1956.
- Fridh (Å. J.) *Terminologie et formules dans les Variae de Cassiodore. Étude sur le développement du style administratif aux derniers siècles de l'antiquité.* (Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia, ii.) Pp. xi + 200. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1956. Paper, Kr. 20.

- Godel (R.) *Platon à Héliopolis d'Égypte*. Pp. 83. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1956. Paper.
- Grant (M.) *Tacitus on Imperial Rome*. A new translation of the *Annals*. Pp. 447. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1956. Paper, 5s. net.
- Hadas (M.) *Seneca's Medea*. Translated with an introduction. Pp. 39. New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1956. Paper, 45 c.
- Hondius-Crone (A.) *The Temple of Nehalennia at Domburg*. Pp. 123, incl. 44 plates. Amsterdam: Meulenhoff, 1956. Cloth.
- Hubert (C.), Pohlentz (M.) *Plutarchus: Moralia*, vol. v, fasc. 3. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubneriana.) Pp. xii+117. Leipzig: Teubner, 1956. Cloth and boards, DM. 5.40.
- Jacoby (F.) *Navicula Chiloniensis*. *Studia philologica Felici Jacoby professori Chiloniensi emerito octogenario oblata*. Pp. x+215. Leiden: Brill, 1956. Cloth, fl. 30.
- Kumaniecki (C. F.) *Andreae Fricii Modrevii opera omnia*. Vol. ii: *Orationes*. Pp. 198. Vol. iii: *De Ecclesia libri secundus*. Pp. Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1954, 1955. Cloth, zł. 22, 31.
- Lee (R. W.) *Historical Conspectus of Roman Law*. Revised impression. Pp. vii+48. London: Sweet & Maxwell, 1956. Paper, 5s. net.
- Lee (R. W.) *The Elements of Roman Law*, with a translation of the *Institutes of Justinian*. Fourth edition. Pp. xxviii+499. London: Sweet & Maxwell, 1956. Cloth, 30s. net.
- Levy (G. R.) *Plato in Sicily*. Pp. 161. London: Faber, 1956. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Marót (K.) *A görög irodalom kezdetei*. [The Beginnings of Greek Literature: in Hungarian with German summary.] Pp. 377; 12 plates. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1956. Cloth, 50 Fl.
- Martin (R.) *L'Urbanisme dans la Grèce antique*. Pp. 304; 32 plates, 64 figs. Paris: Picard, 1956. Paper, 3,500 fr.
- Mattingly (H.) *Essays in Roman Coinage presented to Harold Mattingly*. Edited by R. A. G. Carson and C. H. V. Sutherland. Pp. xiv+292; 8 plates. London: Oxford University Press, 1956. Cloth, 60s. net.
- Milliken (E. K.) *The Cradles of Western Civilization*. Pp. 208; ill. London: Harrap, 1956. Cloth, 7s. 6d.
- Modrzejewski (J.) *Polish Papyrology in the Years 1945-1955*. Pp. 53. Warsaw: Polish Academy of Sciences, 1955. Paper.
- Mohrmann (C.) *Latin vulgaire; Latin des chrétiens; Latin médiéval*. Pp. 54. Paris: Klincksieck, 1955. Paper, 240 fr.
- Neubecker (A. J.) *Die Bewertung der Musik bei Stoikern und Epikureern*. Eine Analyse von Philodemos Schrift *De Musica*. Pp. 103. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1956. Paper, DM. 11.
- Niedermann (M.) *Hommages à Max Niedermann*. (Collection Latomus, xxiii.) Pp. 352. Brussels: Latomus, 1956. Paper.
- Palm (J.) *Über Sprache und Stil des Diodoros von Sizilien*. Pp. 212. Lund: Gleerup, 1956. Paper, Kr. 33.
- Pastorino (A.) *Iuli Firmici Materni de Errore Profanarum Religionum*. (Biblioteca di Studi Superiori, xxvii.) Pp. lxxvi+300. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1956. Paper, L. 3,000.
- Peck (W.) *Griechische Vers-Inschriften*. Band i: *Grab-Epigramme*. Pp. xxx+695. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1955. Paper, DM. 70.
- Richter (G. M. A.) *Ancient Italy. A Study of the Interrelations of its Peoples as shown in their Arts*. Pp. xxiv+137; 304 figs. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1956. Cloth, 120s. net.
- Seltman (C. S.) *The Twelve Olympians and their guests*. Pp. 208. London: Max Parrish, 1956. Cloth, 15s. 6d. net.
- Snell (B.) *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis*. Editio altera. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubneriana.) Pp. viii+375. Leipzig: Teubner, 1956. Cloth and boards, DM. 14.80.
- Suolahti (J.) *The Junior Officers of the Roman Army in the Republican Period: a Study on Social Structure*. (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, ser. B, tom. 97.) Pp. 439. Helsinki: Finnish Academy, 1955. Paper, 1,500 mk.
- Talcott (L.), Philippaki (B.), Edwards (G. R.), Grace (V. R.) *Small Objects from the Pryx: ii*. (Hesperia, Supplement x.) Pp. 189; 80 plates. Princeton, N.J.: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1956. Paper, \$7.50.
- Taylor (A. E.) *Plato: Philebus and Epinomis*. Translation and Introduction. Pp. vi+272. Edinburgh: Nelson, 1956. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Thiel (J. H.) *A History of Roman Sea-Power before the Second Punic War*. Pp. viii+367. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1954. Cloth, fl. 25.
- Unterstein (M.) *Senofane: Testimonianze e Frammenti*. (Biblioteca di Studi Superiori, xxxiii.) Pp. cclxxx+160. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1956. Paper, L. 4,000.

*Warrington* (J.) Aristotle's *Metaphysics* edited and translated. (Everyman's Library, No. 1000.) Pp. xxvii+388. London: Dent, 1956. Cloth, 7s. net.

*Webster* (T. B. L.) *Art and Literature in Fourth-Century Athens*. Pp. xvi+159; 16 plates. London: Athlone Press, 1956. Cloth, 25s. net.

*Whitfield* (B. G.) *A Classical Handbook for Sixth Forms*. Pp. 77. Oxford: Blackwell, 1956. Cloth, 12s. 6d.

*Will* (E.) *Exploration archéologique de Délos faite par l'École française d'Athènes. Fascicule xxii: Le Dôdékathéon*. Pp. 191; 25 plates in portfolio. Paris: de Boccard, 1955.



*Continued from p. 2 of cover]*

D. A. MALCOLM, 136; *Manuale dei dialetti italiani* (Bottiglioni), D. M. JONES, 137; *Essays on the History of Religions* (Pettazzoni), W. K. C. GUTHRIE, 139; *Attic Vase Paintings in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston*, ii (Beazley), P. E. CORBETT, 141; *Greek Portraits* (Richter), J. M. G. TOYNBEE, 143; *La notion juridique d'indépendance et la tradition hellénique* (Ténékidès), H. D. WESTLAKE, 144; *La société romaine*, i (van den Bruwaene), H. H. SCULLARD, 146; *Fasti Capitolini* (Degrassi), A. G. WOODHEAD, 147; *Consilium Principis* (Crook), J. P. V. D. BALSDON, 149; *Il confine nord-orientale dell' Italia romana* (Degrassi), J. M. REYNOLDS, 151; *Rome beyond the Imperial Frontiers* (Wheeler), J. M. REYNOLDS, 153; *Rome et son empire* (Aymard, Auboyer), P. A. BRUNT, 155; *Byzantine Studies* (Baynes), S. RUNCIMAN, 158; *Ancilla to Classical Reading* (Hadas), H. LL. HUDSON-WILLIAMS, 160.

Short Reviews	162
Summaries of Periodicals	185
Books Received	186

*The Publishers acknowledge with gratitude a generous grant from the British Academy towards the cost of this number*

## The Classical Association

The objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £5. 5s.). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association. They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 30s., *Quarterly* 25s.; combined subscription £2. 13s.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 20s.

Copies of the final issue of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (covering the years 1945-7) and of the volume for 1939-45 can still be obtained for 6s. each from Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, who can also supply many of the pre-war back numbers at 2s. 6d. per volume, post free.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. J. S. Shields, Queen Mary's School, Basingstoke, Hants. Inquiries should be sent to either of the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, and Mr. T. W. Melliush, Bec School, London, S.W. 17) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz. Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Cardiff, East Anglia, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northamptonshire, North Staffordshire, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales (Bangor), Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Shrewsbury, Southampton, South-Western (Exeter), Sussex, Swansea, Tees-side, Worcester and Malvern.



## The Loeb Classical Library

Edited by

† T. E. PAGE, C.H., LITT.D. † W. H. D. ROUSE, LITT.D.

† E. CAPPS, PH.D., LL.D.

L. A. POST, M.A. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A., F.R.HIST.SOC.

Founded by JAMES LOEB

*Each volume Foolscap 8vo, 400-700 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 15s. net*

A series of Greek and Latin Texts, with English Translations on the opposite page. The series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

'We shall never be independent of our Loeb.'—*Times Literary Supplement*.

### NEW VOLUMES, 1955-56

#### LATIN

402 CAESAR. Alexandrian, African and Spanish Wars. Translated by A. G. Way.

393 PLINY, NATURAL HISTORY. Ten volumes, Vol. VII, Books XXIV-XXVII. Translated by W. H. S. Jones.

#### GREEK

400 ARISTOTLE. On Sophistical Refutations; On Coming-to-be and Passing-away; On the Cosmos. Translated by E. S. Forster and D. J. Furley.

**William Heinemann, Ltd., Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey**

**HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.**

*Photographic Reprints of the*

## INDEX VOLUME TO THE PALACE OF MINOS

by SIR ARTHUR EVANS

£5/5/- NET

Dr. Joan Evans, compiler of the Index, included in it special sections classified in detail and chronologically arranged by Sir Arthur Evans, thus providing a valuable reference work, which he intended should be useful also for students who have access to, but do not possess, the complete work.

---

**W. HEFFER & SONS LTD., CAMBRIDGE**